



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search


Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

$$245491 \text{ d. } \frac{23}{2(3)}$$

$$= \text{S. Hunt Ist. } 2^0 \frac{1}{2(3)}$$

$$\text{S. Th. } 270^\circ / 2(3)$$

$$= \text{S Th. F. } 27.1 / 2(3)$$



NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

MESSRS. CLARK have pleasure in forwarding to their Subscribers the First Issue of the FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY for 1886, viz. :—

SCHÜRER'S HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST. Second Division. Vol. III.
ERRARD'S APOLOGETICS. Vol. I.

The Volumes issued during 1880–1885 were :—

GODET'S COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE ROMANS. Two Vols.
HAGENBACH'S HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. Three Vols.
DORNER'S SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Four Vols.
MARTENSEN'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (Individual Ethics.)
MARTENSEN'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (Social Ethics.)
WEISS'S BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Two Vols.
WEISS'S LIFE OF CHRIST. Three Vols.
GOREL ON THE PARABLES OF JESUS.
SARTORIUS'S DOCTRINE OF DIVINE LOVE.
RÄNGER'S ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THEOLOGY. Two Vols.
EWALD'S REVELATION; ITS NATURE AND RECORD.
KEIL'S OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY OF THE CONSUMMATION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.
SCHÜRER'S HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST. Division II. Vols. I. and II.

The FOREIGN THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY was commenced in 1846, and from that time to this Four Volumes yearly (or 158 in all) have appeared with the utmost regularity.

The Binding of the present Series is modernized, so as to distinguish it from the former.

The Subscription Price will remain as formerly, 21s. annually for Four Volumes, payable in advance. (The Subscription Price for the Volumes of New Series—1880 to 1886—is therefore Seven Guineas.)

The Publishers beg to announce as in preparation—

SCHÜRER'S HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST. Division I.
ERRARD'S APOLOGETICS—(continuation).
GODET'S COMMENTARY ON CORINTHIANS.
KEIL'S HANDBOOK OF BIBLICAL ARCHAEOLOGY.
FRANK'S SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN EVIDENCE.
DORNER'S CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

A Selection of 20 Volumes may be had at the Subscription Price of Five Guineas, from the works issued previous to 1883.

Messrs. Clark take this opportunity of expressing their thanks for the favour with which this New Series of the Foreign Theological Library has been received.

May they request an early remittance of Subscription for 1886.

CLARK'S
FOREIGN
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY.

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXV.

Schürer's History of the Jewish People.

DIVISION II. VOL. III.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK. 88 GEORGE STREET.
1886.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB,

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON, . . . HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.

DUBLIN, . . . GEORGE HERBERT.

NEW YORK, . . . SCRIBNER AND WELFORD.

A HISTORY
OF
THE JEWISH PEOPLE
IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST.

BY
EMIL SCHÜRER, D.D., M.A.,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GIESSEN.

*Being a Second and Revised Edition of a "Manual of
the History of New Testament Times."*

Second Division.

~~THE~~ INTERNAL CONDITION OF PALESTINE, AND OF THE
JEWISH PEOPLE, IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST.

TRANSLATED BY
SOPHIA TAYLOR AND REV. PETER CHRISTIE.

VOL. III.


EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.
1886.

1886

7

1886

Digitized by Google



THE PORTIONS OF THE TRANSLATORS RESPECTIVELY ARE—

By REV. PETER CHRISTIE, pp. 1-155.

By MISS TAYLOR, pp. 156 to end.

CONTENTS OF DIVISION II. VOL. III.

	PAGE
§ 32. THE PALESTINIAN-JEWISH LITERATURE,	1
I. Historiography,	6
1. The First Book of Maccabees,	6
2. The History of John Hyrcanus,	13
3. Josephus' History of the Jewish War,	14
II. The Psalmodic Literature,	15
1. The Psalms of the Maccabean Age,	15
2. The Psalms of Solomon,	17
III. The Gnostic Wisdom,	23
1. Jesus the Son of Sirach,	23
2. The Pirke Aboth,	30
IV. Hortatory Narrative,	32
1. The Book of Judith,	32
2. The Book of Tobit,	37
V. Pseudepigraphic Prophecies,	44
1. The Book of Daniel,	44
2. The Book of Enoch,	59
3. The Assumptio Mosis,	73
4. The Apocalypse of Baruch,	83
5. The Fourth Book of Ezra,	93
6. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,	114
7. The Lost Pseudepigraphic Prophecies,	124
VI. The Sacred Legends,	133
1. The Book of Jubilees,	134
2. The Martyrdom of Isaiah,	141
3. The Lost Legendary Works: The Books of Adam— Abraham — Moses and his Time — (Jannes and Jambres),	146
VII. Books of Magic and Magical Spells,	151
§ 33. THE GRAECO-JEWISH LITERATURE,	156
I. Translations of Holy Scriptures,	159
1. The Septuagint,	159
2. Aquila and Theodotion,	168
II. Revision and Completion of Scripture Literature,	175
1. The Greek Ezra,	177
2. Additions to Esther,	181

taken very much cum grano salis. By the Palestinian Jewish literature we mean that which, in all essential (but only essential) respects, represents the standpoint of Pharisaic Judaism as it had developed itself in Palestine; while by the Hellenistic Jewish literature again we mean that which, either as regards form or matter, bears traces, to any noticeable extent, of Hellenistic influences. The products belonging to the first-mentioned group were for the most part composed in Hebrew; but the fact of their having been so composed must not be regarded as a decisive criterion, and that for the simple reason that, in numerous instances, it is no longer possible to make out whether it was Hebrew or Greek that was the original language, but further because, in the case of several compositions, the circumstance of their being written in Greek is a thing purely external and accidental. And hence it is that we also include in this group several writings that possibly, nay probably, were composed in Greek at the very first, while reserving for the other group only those that show pretty evident traces of Hellenistic influence either in the form or the matter. But the line of demarcation between the two cannot be sharply defined, there being in fact some writings that have almost as much title to be included in the one group as in the other. And just as the distinction we have adopted is not intended to imply that those belonging to the one group were written in Hebrew and those belonging to the other in Greek, so as little do we intend it to be understood by our use of the term "Palestinian" that all the compositions included under this designation were written in Palestine. For there was Palestinian Judaism outside of Palestine, just as conversely there was Hellenistic Judaism within it.

In the period now under consideration, literary efforts as such were essentially foreign to "*Palestinian*" Judaism. One might almost venture to say that it had no literature at all. For the few literary productions of which it could boast had, for the most part, a purely practical aim, and had but a

very slender connection with each other. *It is precisely from these writings themselves that we can see how true it is that zeal for the law and for the faith of the fathers eclipsed every other interest. When any one took to writing he did so as a rule for the purpose of, in one form or another, exhorting his readers to keep firm hold of those precious blessings, or of indirectly helping to increase and strengthen a spirit of faithful devotion to the law. Literary pursuits as such, and the cultivation of literature in the interests of culture generally, were things quite unknown to genuine Judaism. Its "culture" consisted in the knowledge and observance of the law.*

Looked at from this standpoint, it was a somewhat extraordinary thing to find that, in the palmy days of the Hasmonaeen dynasty, works of *native history* had been composed (*the First Book of Maccabees, the Chronicles of Hyrcanus*). This presupposed the existence of a patriotic self-consciousness, for which native history as such was a thing of some value. Later on, after the Hasmonaeen dynasty had been overthrown, we no longer meet with any further traces of Jewish historiography such as those now referred to; and so for his information with regard to this period Josephus had to depend on other than Jewish sources. We already begin to notice indications of an intimate connection with the aims of legal Judaism in those *Psalms* that were composed during this period in imitation of the older models (*the Maccabaeen Psalms, the Psalter of Solomon*). The whole of those compositions were written with a view to religious edification, and therefore—for at that time religion meant simply a firm adherence to the law—more or less with the view of fostering and quickening a spirit of faithful devotion to the law. In our period, what is known as *gnomic wisdom* exercised a direct influence in the way of promoting the spirit in question. For notwithstanding the very diversified character of the wisdom of life exhibited in the proverbs of Jesus the son of Sirach, their alpha and omega is simply this: fear God and keep His commandments. Then in the maxims of the scribes of the

time of the Mishna, and which have been collected in the *Pirke Aboth*, we hear from beginning to end and in every variety of tone the exhortation to a strict observance of the law. But there was a species of literature of a totally different character that also served precisely the same end, viz. the *hortatory narrative* (*Judith, Tobit*). When, in compositions of this class, we have brought before us, in a somewhat imaginative fashion, the doings and the fortunes of persons who had been distinguished for their heroic faith or their exemplary piety, and who had at the same time been sustained by the divine help, the object of the story is not to entertain the reader, but to inculcate the truth that the fear of God is the highest wisdom, and that a fear of God in the sense of legal Pharisaic Judaism. But in our period a more favourite kind of literature still than the hortatory narrative was the genuine *prophetic exhortation*, i.e. exhortations based upon alleged special revelations with regard to the future destinies of the people. It was a favourite practice to put such revelations in the mouths of the recognised authorities of the olden time, with the view of thereby giving peculiar weight to the exhortations and the consolations based upon them. The object therefore of those *pseudepigraphic prophetic compositions* (*Daniel, Enoch, The Ascension of Moses, The Apocalypse of Baruch, The Apocalypse of Ezra, The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and others*) was always of an eminently practical kind, viz. consolation amid the sufferings of the present, and encouragement to maintain a steadfast adherence to the law by pointing to the certainty of future rewards and punishments. None of those literary productions could be said to have had any direct connection with the professional labours of the scribes. No doubt they served to promote a spirit of faithful devotion to the law, but they had no concern with the law and the Holy Scriptures as such; we should rather regard them as free literary productions of a very diversified character, and composed for the most part in imitation of the older models. In the period now in question

the labours of the scribes, labours which concerned themselves with the text of the Holy Scriptures and with the work of forming new adaptations of that text either on its legal or its historical and dogmatic side, were as yet chiefly of an oral kind. This holds true above all with regard to the process of *adaptation as applied to the law*. It was not till toward the close of our period, in the time of R. Akiba, that the results of these learned adaptations of the law began to be committed to writing (see Div. ii. vol. i. p. 376).¹ On the other hand however there undoubtedly existed as early as our period *literary adaptations or reconstructions of sacred history* framed in the spirit of scribism. The Book of Chronicles may be taken as a case in point, inasmuch as it treats the earlier history of Israel in such a way as to make it accord with the ideals of later Judaism (see Div. ii. vol. i. p. 339). But we have a classical example of the Haggadic Midrash in the *Book of Jubilees*, which in any case falls within the period with which we are here dealing. It reconstructs the history of the canonical Book of Genesis entirely after the fashion of the Rabbinical Midrash. Other literary productions, which in all probability fall no less within our period, select certain episodes or personages from sacred history around which they seek to shed a halo of glory by means of fictitious legends (the Books of Adam, the History of Jannes and Jambres, and others). It would appear however that, at first, Hellenistic did more in this way than Rabbinical Judaism. For this latter the palmy

¹ Epiphanius no doubt repeatedly mentions a *Mishna of the Hasmonaeans* (*Haer.* xxxiii. 9: *διδασκαλίας . . . τῶν υἱῶν Ἀσμοναίου*, also *Haer.* xv., and similarly *Haer.* xlii. p. 332, ed. Petav.). But the notice in question is of so confused a character that it does not admit of being used for historical purposes. There is also some degree of obscurity about the statement in the *Megillath Taanith* to the effect that on the 14th of Tammuz "*the Book of the Decrees*" (ספר נזירות) had been abolished (Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 103, 443, 445; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 3rd ed. iii. 606). According to the ordinary view a Sadducean penal code is supposed to be meant. At all events we have no undoubted evidence to show that, previous to the time of Akiba, the Pharisaic legal traditions had been committed to writing.

days of haggadean fiction did not begin till the Talmudic age. The object of those modifications or embellishments of sacred history was now no longer of so directly practical a character as it had been in the case of the majority of the writings previously mentioned. They owed their origin in the first instance to the universal interest that was taken in the sacred history generally, to the desire to have as exact and complete and accurate an acquaintance with it as possible, in connection with which however the tendency to embellish it also began at once to assert itself. And yet this tendency again had now in like manner an ulterior practical aim. In thus throwing around the sacred history as bright a halo as possible, the object was to show to what an extent Israel had from time to time been enjoying the miraculous protection of its God, but above all how, by their exemplary conduct and wonderful exploits, the holy patriarchs had proved themselves to be true men of God.

Thus we see then that it was objects chiefly of a practical kind that the literary efforts of Palestinian Judaism sought to serve. This was at least true of the department of history, with the consideration of which we will now enter upon our present subject.

I. HISTORIOGRAPHY.

1. *The First Book of Maccabees.*

Short notices of the Maccabæan rising, and of the brothers Judas, Jonathan and Simon Maccabæus, who played so prominent a part in it, must have been committed to writing shortly after the events themselves. For it is simply impossible that any writer living two generations after could have been so well informed with regard to those events as we find the author of the First Book of Maccabees to be unless he had been able to avail himself of existing written sources.²

² We have probably an allusion to those sources in 1 Macc. ix. 22: καὶ τὰ περισσὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰουδᾶ καὶ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνδραγαθῶν ὧν

Those *sources of the First Book of Maccabees* — though we know nothing further of their origin and nature—are therefore entitled to foremost mention in any complete list of the historical literature of our period.

Our *First Book of Maccabees* itself gives a connected, minute and graphic narrative of the events that led to the Maccabæan rising, then of the course of the rising itself, particularly of the exploits and fortunes of Judas Maccabæus. It then proceeds to give the further history of the patriotic enterprises of the Jews, under the leadership of Jonathan, the brother of Judas, and of the institution of the Hasmonæan high priesthood and the founding of Jewish independence by the former. Then lastly we have an account of Simon, Jonathan's brother and successor who, by establishing the combined office of priest and prince and making it hereditary in the family of the Hasmonæans on the one hand, and by the complete emancipation of the Jewish people from Syrian supremacy on the other, completed on both its sides the work undertaken by Jonathan. The narrative is brought down to the death of Simon, so that altogether it embraces a period of forty years (175–135 B.C.). The *standpoint* of the author is that of orthodox, rigidly legal Judaism. But yet it is somewhat remarkable that the successes with which the Maccabæan enterprises were crowned are almost nowhere attributed to any immediate supernatural intervention on the part of God, but are represented throughout as the result of the military skill and political wisdom of the Maccabæan princes. Of course those princes always act with an unshaken trust in the powerful protection and help of God. It would therefore be a mistake to suppose that the author is not animated by a

ἰστοίης καὶ τῆς μεγαλᾶς αὐτοῦ οὐ κατεγράφη, πολλά γὰρ ἦν σφοδρά. After οὐ κατεγράφη, we may suppose either "in this book" or "in the existing literature" to be understood. Probably the latter sense should be preferred, see Grimm, *Exeget. Handbuch zu 1 Makk.* p. 22 sq. The use of written sources in the First Book of Maccabees is also admitted for example by Nöldeke (*Die alttestamentliche Literatur*, p. 67) and Mendelssohn (*Acta societatis phil. Lips.*, ed. Ritschellius, vol. v. 1875, p. 99).

religious spirit. But still his way of putting things is at the same time rather different from that of the earlier historical works of the Old Testament. His *style* is the plain narrative style, being similar to that adopted in Old Testament historiography. The author has at his disposal such a fund of details that it is impossible to entertain any doubt as to the *credibility* of his narrative as a whole. His book is one of the most valuable sources we possess for the history of the Jewish people. Nor is its value in this respect in any way affected by the fact that the author shows himself to be very imperfectly informed with regard to the state of things among foreign nations. We see in this only the simple standpoint of the observer who, following his sources, confines his view exclusively to the circle of Jewish affairs. Again, the freedom with which numbers are dealt with and discourses put in the mouths of leading personages can scarcely be regarded as telling against the author. In matters of this sort ancient historians generally were never particularly scrupulous. It is a singularly fortunate circumstance that the dates of *all the more important events are duly fixed in accordance with a definite era, namely the Seleucidian era of the year 312 B.C.* (on the question as to whether in the present instance this era was made to date from the usual starting-point or from another somewhat different from it, see § 3). As regards the *date of composition*, it is admitted on all hands that this work must have been written previous to the Roman conquest, and therefore previous to the year 63 B.C. For as yet the Romans are known to the author merely as friends and protectors of the Jewish people in contrast to the Syrian kings. On the other hand, he is already acquainted with a chronicle referring to the history of John Hyrcanus, so that he must have written, at the soonest, toward the close of that prince's reign, probably not till after its close. According to this the work would be composed during the first decades of the first century before Christ. It was written *originally in Hebrew* (or Aramaic), as may be confidently

inferred from its grammatical peculiarities, and as is further confirmed by the testimony of Origen and Jerome. The Hebrew (or Aramaic) title *Σαρβήθ Σαβαναίλ*, handed down by Origen, still continues to be as much as ever an unsolved enigma. The work has come down to us only in the form of a *Greek translation*, which was probably in existence as early as the time of Josephus. That it is still extant is due to the circumstance of its having been incorporated with the Greek Bible and, as forming part of this latter, read in the Christian Church.

At the close of his account of the Hebrew canon Origen adds (as quoted in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 25. 2): "Ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐστὶ τὰ Μακκαβαϊκὰ, ἑπὶ πεντήκοντα Σαρβήθ Σαβαναίλ. Consequently he was acquainted with the First Book of Maccabees (for unquestionably it is that is meant) in its Hebrew form, but as not belonging to the Hebrew canon. Jerome, *Prologus galeatus* to the Books of Samuel (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ix. 459 sq.): *Machabæorum primum librum Hebraicum reperi. Secundus Graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque φράσι probari potest.* An endless variety of hypotheses have been advanced with the view of explaining the meaning of the title mentioned by Origen (see Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* iii. 745; Grimm, *Ezeget. Handbuch* to 1 Macc. p. xvii.; Keil, *Commentar über die Bücher der Makkabder*, p. 22; Curtiss, *The Name Machabee*, 1876, p. 30; and the general literature mentioned below). But nearly all of them are based upon the reading *Σαρβήθ Σαρβαναίλ* so generally adopted since Stephanus, whereas, according to the testimony of the manuscripts, the only reading that can claim to be recognised is *Σαρβήθ Σαβαναίλ* (so also Josephus the Christian, *Hypomnest.* c. xxv. in Fabricius' *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* vol. ii. p. 48 of Appendix).

The acquaintance of Josephus with the *First Book of Maccabees* is generally regarded as beyond a doubt; his acquaintance, on the other hand, with our Greek text has been questioned. In his German translation of 1 Maccabees (1778), Michaelis has propounded the view that Josephus made use of the Hebrew text. His arguments however are not of a cogent nature. The conjecture has recently been hazarded by Destinon (*Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, 1882, pp. 60-91) that Josephus (or rather, as Destinon thinks, the anonymous writer whose work Josephus has merely remodelled) had an older redaction of 1 Maccabees before him which, on the one hand, was, in regard to many points, rather fuller than our book, while, on the other, it wanted as yet the whole of the last section, chaps. xiv.-xvi., which is to be regarded as a subsequent addition. But the first point cannot be sufficiently substantiated; for the extra matters found in Josephus were either drawn from other sources or had their origin in the historian's own imagination. As for the other question again, whether Josephus was acquainted with the concluding section of the book, it is one that

of course deserves consideration in view of the singular brevity with which the historian disposes of the reign of Simon. As favouring the view that Josephus was acquainted with our Greek text, see Grimm, *Ezeget. Handbuch* to 1 Macc. p. xxviii. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*, 1879, pp. 80-90.

In the Christian Church our book has been read from the very first. See Tertullian, *Adv. Judaeos*, c. iv.: Nam et temporibus Maccabaeorum sabbatis pugnando fortiter fecerunt, etc. (comp. 1 Macc. ii. 41 sqq.). Hippolytus, in narrating the history of the Maccabean rising in his *Comment. in Daniel*, c. xxxi.-xxxii. (*Opp.* ed. Lagarde, p. 163), adheres closely to our book, quoting 1 Macc. ii. 33 sqq. almost word for word. Origen (besides the passage in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 25. 2, already mentioned), particularly *Comment. in epist. ad Rom.* book viii. chap. i. (in Lommatzsch, vii. 193): Sicut Mathathias, de quo in primo libro Machabaeorum scriptum est quia "zelatus est in lege Dei," etc. (1 Macc. ii. 24). Observe the designation of our book as the *First Book of Maccabees*, precisely as in the case of Jerome in the passage already quoted and in that of Eusebius, *Demonstr. evang.* viii. 2. 72, ed. Gaisford. Cyprian quotes several passages from the book in his *Testimonia*, and always with the formula, in *Machabaeis* (*Testimon.* iii. 4, 15, 53). For the further history of the book in the Christian Church, see the various works and dissertations on the history of the Old Testament canon, also Jahn's *Einleitung in die göttl. Bücher des Alten Bundes*, 2nd ed. Part ii. § 3 and 4 (1803), 1st and 2nd supplements, and likewise my article "Apokryphen des A. T.," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 485-489. As is well known, it has been the practice in the Protestant Church to follow Jerome in applying the designation "Apocrypha" to such books as are not included in the Hebrew canon, and it so happens that our book is one of them.

From the history of the book just given, it will be seen that the Greek text has been transmitted to us only through the manuscripts of the Greek Bible. The Books of Maccabees being omitted in Codex Vaticanus, 1209, the most important manuscripts here are the Codex Sinaiticus (quoted in Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha as x.), and the Codex Alexandrinus (known in Fritzsche, as in Holmes and Parsons before him, as No. iii.); next to these comes a Codex Venetus (known in the critical apparatuses as No. 23). All the other manuscripts are minusculi. For more precise information on this point, see my article "Apocrypha," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. pp. 489-491. The text of our book, in common with that of the so-called Apocrypha generally, is to be found in the majority of the editions of the *Septuagint*. The received text is borrowed from the Sixtine edition (*Vetus Testamentum juxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti v. Pont. Max. editum*, Romae 1587). The most copious critical apparatus we have is to be found in the *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, edd. Holmes et Parsons, 5 vols. Oxonii, 1798-1827 (the whole of the Apocrypha are given together in the fifth volume). We have a handy portable edition in the shape of the *Vetus Testamentum Graece juxta LXX. interpretes*, ed. Tischendorf, 2 vols. Leipzig. 1850 (6th ed. 1880). Tischendorf as well as Holmes and Parsons follow the Sixtine text. Among the separate editions of the Apocrypha we may mention the *Libri Vet. Test. Apocryphi, textum graecum recognovit, Augusti*, Lips. 1804, and the *Libri Vet. Test. apocryphi graece, accurate*

recognitos, ed. Apel, Lips. 1837. The latest and best of such editions, although even it fails as yet to satisfy every requirement, is the *Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti graece, recensuit et cum commentario critico*, edidit Fritzsche, Lips. 1871 (Fritzsche gives a recension of his own based upon the materials furnished by Holmes and Parsons, and upon the recently acquired Codex Sinaiticus as well as the fragments in the Codex Ephraemi). So far as some of the books are concerned, Fritzsche had not as yet collated them with the most important of the manuscripts, the Codex Vaticanus, there being no complete collation in Holmes and Parsons. It is true no doubt that this manuscript had been already made use of for the Sixtine edition, so that so far it helped to shape the received text. But the text of the Vaticanus could not be said to be known to any trustworthy extent till the issue of the new Roman edition (*Biblorum Sacrorum Graecus Codex Vaticanus*, edd. Vercellone et Cozza, 6 vols. Rome 1868–1881; comp. *Theol. Litzig*. 1882, p. 121). The edition of Mai (*Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano*, 5 vols. Rome 1857) is unreliable. Nestle has added to the latest edition of Tischendorf's Septuagint, a collation based upon the edition of Vercellone and Cozza (also published separately under the title, *Veteris Testamenti codices Vaticanus et Sinaiticus cum textu recepto collati ab E. Nestle*, Lips. 1880).³ For more on the editions, see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. i. 494 sq.

Of the early translations the following are of interest in connection with the history of the transmission of the text: (1) The Latin of which there are two, (a) the one that was incorporated with the Vulgate, and (b) another which, as far as chap. xiii., has been preserved in a *Codex Sangermanensis*, both being given in Sabatier, *Biblorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. ii. Remis 1743. (2) The Syriac in the Peshito (separate edition, *Libri Vet. Test. apocryphi Syriace*, ed. Lagarde, Lips. 1861). In the great Peshito manuscript of Milan reproduced in photo-lithograph by Ceriani (*Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice Ambrosiano*, ed. Ceriani, 2 vols. Milan 1876–1888), we have, as far as chap. xiv., a Syriac translation which deviates from the printed received text; see Ceriani's prolegomena; and Nestle, *Theol. Literaturztg.* 1884, col. 28. For more on the early translations, see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 491–494. Also the texts in the London *Polyglot*, vol. iv.

Exegetical Aids. (1) *Special lexicon*: Wahl, *Clavis librorum Veteris Testamenti apocryphorum philologica*, Lips. 1853. (2) *Modern versions*: the German translations of De Wette (*Die heil. Schrift des A. und N. T.'s übersetzt*, 4th ed. 1858) and of Holtzmann (in Bunsen's *Bibelwerk für die Gemeinde*, vol. vii. Leipzig 1869), the latter with short notes. Versions in other modern languages: Dijserinck, *De apocriefe boeken des ouden verbonds*,

³ The above observations on the Codex Vaticanus are made merely with the view of indicating on what side Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha generally stands in need of revision and greater completeness. The *First Book of Maccabees* is precisely that portion of the Apocrypha to which those observations do not apply for the simple reason that it is not found in that codex.

uit het grieksch opnieuw vertaald en met opschriften en eenige aantekeningen voorzien, Haarlem 1874. Reuss, *La Bible, traduction nouvelle avec introductions et commentaires, Ancien Testament*, VI^e partie, *Philosophie religieuse et morale des Hebreux*, Paris 1879 (containing among others Sirach, Wisdom, Tobit, the appendices to Daniel, Baruch, the Prayer of Manasseh); VII^e partie of the same work, *Literature politique et polemique*, Paris 1879 (containing among others, the Books of Maccabees, Judith, Bel and the Dragon, Epistle of Jeremiah). Bissell, *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament with historical introductions, a revised translation, and notes critical and explanatory*, New York 1880. On Luther's translation, see Grimm, *Luthers Uebersetzung der A.T. Apokr.* (Stud. u. Krit. 1883, pp. 375-400). (3) Commentaries: J. D. Michaelis, *Deutsche Uebersetzung des ersten Buchs der Maccabäer mit Anmerkungen*, 1778. Grimm, *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer erklärt* (Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des A. T.'s, 3 parts), Leipzig 1858 (by far the most sterling work on the subject which we possess). Keil, *Commentar über die Bücher der Maccabäer*, Leipzig 1875. For additional exegetical literature, see Grimm, p. xxxiv. sq. Fürst, *Bibliotheca Judaica*, ii. 317 sq., and Herzog's *Real-Enc.* vol. i. 496.

Works of critical inquiry: Frölich, *Annales compendiarii regum et rerum Syriae*, Viennae 1744. E. F. Wernsdorf, *De fontibus historiae Syriae in libris Maccabaeorum prolusio*, Lips. 1746. Frölich, *De fontibus historiae Syriae in libris Maccabaeorum prolusio Lipsiae edita in examen vocata*, Viennae 1746. Gottl. Wernsdorf, *Commentatio historico-critica de fide historica librorum Maccabaicorum*, Wratislav. 1747. (Khell), *Auctoritas utriusque libri Maccabaici canonico-historica adserta*, Viennae 1749. Rosenthal, *Das erste Maccabäerbuch*, Leipzig 1867. Schnedermann, *Ueber das Judenthum der beiden ersten Maccabäerbücher* (Zeitschr. für kirchl. Wissensch. und kirchl. Leben, 1884, pp. 78-100). Critical material is also to be found in the early and the more recent polemical treatises on the value of the Apocrypha by Rainold, Keerl, Stier, Hengstenberg, Vincenzi, and others; see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. p. 489.

For the circumstances under which our book and the Apocrypha generally were written, see Jahn, *Einleitung in die göttl. Bücher des A. B.*, 2nd ed., second part, 3rd and 4th secs., Wien 1803. Eichhorn, *Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften des A. T.*, Leipzig 1795. Bertholdt, *Historisch-kritische Einl. in die sämtl. kanon. und apokr. Schriften des A. und N. T.'s*, 6 vols., Erlangen 1812-1819. Welte, *Specielle Einleitung in die deuterokanonischen Bücher des A. T.'s*, Freiburg 1844 (also under the title, *Einl. in die heil. Schriften des A. T.'s von Herbst*, 2 parts, 3 divisions). Scholz, *Einleitung in die heil. Schriften des A. und N. T.'s*, 3 vols., Köln 1845-1848. Nöldeke, *Die Alttestamentliche Literatur in einer Reihe von Aufsätzen dargestellt*, Leipzig 1868. De Wette, *Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einleitung in die kanonischen und apokryphischen Bücher des A. T.'s*, 8th ed., bearb. von Schrader, Berlin 1869. Reusch, *Lehrb. der Einl. in das A. T.*, 4th ed., Freiburg 1870. Keil, *Lehrb. der hist.-krit. Einleitung in die kanon. und apokryph. Schriften des A. T.'s*, 3rd ed., 1873. Kaulen, *Einleitung in die heil. Schrift A. und N. T.'s*, 2 divisions, 1st part, *Besondere Einl. in das A. T.*, Freiburg 1881. Kleinert, *Abriß der Einleitung zum A. T. in Tabel-*

inform, Berlin 1878. Reuss, *Geschichte der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments*, Braunschweig 1881. Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, 1857, p. 200 sqq. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 602 sqq. Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellez.* iv. 89 sqq.

2. *The History of John Hyrcanus.*

We have probably a work similar to that of the First Book of Maccabees in the *History of John Hyrcanus*, to which reference is made at the close of the former, where it is said, 1 Macc. xvi. 23, 24: *καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν λόγων Ἰωάννου καὶ τῶν πολέμων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀνδραγαθίων αὐτοῦ ὧν ἡνδραγύθησε, καὶ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῶν τειχέων ὧν ᾠκοδόμησε, καὶ τῶν πράξεων αὐτοῦ, ἰδοὺ ταῦτα γέγραπται ἐπὶ βιβλίων ἡμερῶν ἀρχιερωσύνης αὐτοῦ, ἀφ' οὗ ἐγενήθη ἀρχιερεὺς μετὰ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ.* Apart from this notice we have no further information regarding this work. As the reign of John Hyrcanus did not possess the same interest for subsequent generations as the epoch in which Jewish independence was established through the achievements of the Maccabees, the book would have but a limited circulation, and could not fail soon to be lost altogether. It is evident that Josephus knew nothing of it in his time, for the supposition that he made use of it in his *Antiquities*⁴ is more than improbable. What few notices he has regarding the reign of John Hyrcanus at all are either borrowed, in so far as they refer to external political history, from Greek historians, or, in so far as they refer to internal affairs, are of a purely legendary character. No trace can be detected of the use of any contemporary Jewish source. Considering then at how early a period the history of Hyrcanus dropped out of sight, it is inconceivable that it should still have existed in manuscript in the sixteenth century as, following Sixtus Senensis, many have assumed.

In his *Bibliotheca sancta* (Venetiis 1566) Sixtus Senensis gives an account at p. 61 sq. of a *Fourth Book of Maccabees* which he saw in the library of Santes Pagninus at Lyons, and which began as follows: *Καὶ*

⁴ So Bloch, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus* (1879), pp. 90-94.

μετὰ τὸ ἀποκταθῆναι τὸν Σίμωνα ἐγενήθη Ἰωάννης υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς αὐτοῦ. Judging from the enumeration of the contents as given by Sixtus, this book simply narrates the history of John Hyrcanus, and that precisely as in Josephus (the same facts and in the same order). With regard to this he himself observes: *Historiae series et narratio eadem fere est quae apud Josephum libro Antiquitatum decimo tertio; sed stylus, hebraicis idiotismis abundans, longe dispar.* Consequently he ventures to conjecture that it may have been a Greek translation of the history of Hyrcanus mentioned at the end of the First Book of Maccabees. Many modern writers have concurred in this conjecture, and hence their regret that the manuscript should have perished soon after, when the library just mentioned was destroyed by fire (see Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graeca*, iii. 748. Grimm, *Exeget. Handbuch*, note on 1 Macc. xvi. 24). But, in view of the enumeration of the contents given by Sixtus, it seems to me there can hardly be a doubt that the book was simply a reproduction of Josephus, the style being changed perhaps for a purpose.

3. Josephus' History of the Jewish War.

In post-Hasmonaeon times the fondness for writing histories seems to have died away. At least we nowhere come across any hint to the effect that the writing of anything like connected historical narratives had been undertaken by any one.⁵ It was not till the important events of the war, extending from the year 66 to 70 B.C., that the occasion for such histories once more presented itself. The Jewish priest Joseph, son of Matthias, better known under the name of Flavius Josephus, wrote the history of this war, of which he himself had personal knowledge, whether as a passive observer or as playing an active part in it. He composed the work in his own vernacular, therefore in the Aramaic tongue, and intended it chiefly for the benefit of the *ἄνω βάρβαροι*, i.e. the Jews of Mesopotamia and Babylon. Of this work we know nothing beyond what he himself mentions in his Greek

⁵ We know of but two classes of historical documents of any kind belonging to that period: (1) *Family registers*, the preservation and continuation of which were matters of consequence for religious reasons (on these registers see vol. i. pp. 210 and 212). (2) The *Calendar of Fasts*, *Megillath Taanith*, i.e. a list of the days on which, owing to some happy event being commemorated, there was to be no fasting (for details, see § 3). But neither class of writings, although historical documents, can be said to belong to the category of historical literature.

version of the history of the Jewish war, *Bell. Jud. prooem.* 1, where he says: *προυθέμην ἐγὼ τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν, Ἑλλάδι γλώσση μεταβαλὼν, ἃ τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις τῇ πατρίῳ συντάξας ἀνέπεμψα πρότερον, ἀφηγήσασθαι.* The Greek version of this work, in common with the extant works of Josephus generally, belongs to the department of Hellenistico-Jewish literature, and will therefore fall to be mentioned in the next section.

II. THE PSALMODIC LITERATURE.

1. *The Psalms of the Maccabæan Age.*

It had been already observed by Calvin with reference to the 44th Psalm that: *Querimoniae quas continet, proprie conveniunt in miserum illud et calamitosum tempus, quo grassata est saevissima tyrannis Antiochi.* Ever since, the question, whether psalms belonging to the Maccabæan age are also to be found in our canon, has been mooted and more and more answered in the affirmative. It was Hitzig, Lengerke, and Olshausen above all, that referred a large number of the psalms to the time of the Maccabæan struggles and to a still later period (embracing the reign of the Hasmonæan princes down to the second century B.C.). Others have limited the number of Maccabæan psalms to only a very few. But the fact that we have psalms belonging to Maccabæan times in the canon at all is being more and more recognised. Nor is it possible to allege any plausible reason for thinking otherwise. For the assertion, that that was an age but little calculated to develope religious fervour or poetical genius is a mere *petitio principii*, while as little can be said in favour of the other assertion, that at that time the canon had been already closed. For this is just a point about which we simply know nothing whatever unless we ought rather to say that the Book of Daniel alone is sufficient proof to the contrary. If therefore

the possibility of the existence of psalms belonging to Maccabaeian times be beyond question, then it can only be shown from the contents of the different psalms themselves how far that possibility is also a reality. Accordingly there is a wide consensus of opinion in favour of the view that the 44th, 77th, 79th, and 83rd Psalms above all contain within themselves the most powerful reasons possible for ascribing their origin to the Maccabaeian age. It was only then that it could be rightly and fairly asserted, as is done in Ps. xlv., that the people had faithfully adhered to the covenant made with Jehovah and had not deviated from it, and that it was just for this very reason, therefore for their religion, that they were being persecuted (Ps. xlv. 18, 19, 23). It is only to such a time as that that we could well refer the complaints that the "houses of God" (בֵּית־יְהוָה), i.e. the synagogues, had been burnt in the land, and that there is no longer any prophet there (Ps. lxxiv. 8, 9). There is no age except the Maccabaeian to which all that could so well apply which, in Ps. lxxix., is said about the desecration, but not the destruction of the temple, and the laying waste of Jerusalem, and in Ps. lxxxi. on the persecution of Israel. But, if these four psalms had their origin in Maccabaeian times, then there are many more of a kindred nature that must be referred to the same period. The real point at issue then can only be not "whether" there are any such psalms at all, but only "how many of them" there are. And this will always remain a disputed point, for there are but few of the psalms that bear such evident traces of the date and circumstances of their origin as those just mentioned. Meanwhile let it suffice to have pointed out the fact that the holy Church of the Maccabaeian time has given proof of its creative powers in the department of sacred lyrics as well, through those new psalms in which it pours out its wail of distress before God and cries for protection and help from the Almighty.

For the *literature* of this question, see the various introductions to the Old Testament, for example De Wette-Schrader, *Einleit. in die kanon. und*

apokr. Bücher des A. T.'s (1869), § 334; Kleinert, *Abriß der Einl. zum A. T.* (1878) p. 45.

The following authorities have expressed themselves in favour of the view that there are Maccabæan psalms in our canon: Rüdinger (1580). Venema (1762-67). E. G. Bengel, *Dissertatio ad introductiones in librum Psalmorum supplementa quaedam exhibens*, Tübing. 1806. Hitzig, *Begriff der Kritik, am A. T. praktisch erörtert*, Heidelb. 1831. Idem, *Die Psalmen*, 2 vols. Heidelb. 1835, 1836. Idem, *Ueber die Zeitdauer der hebräischen Psalmenpoesie* (*Züricher Monatschr.* 1856, pp. 436-452). Hesse, *De psalmis Maccabaicis*, Vratisl. 1837. Lengerke, *Die fünf Bücher der Psalmen*, 2 vols. Königsberg 1847. Olshausen, *Die Psalmen erklärt*, Leipzig 1853 (being the fourteenth number of the Exegetical Handbook to the Old Testament). De Jong, *Disquisitio de Psalmis Maccabaicis*, Lugd. Bat. 1857. Steiner, art. "Psalmen," in Schenkel's *Bibellez.* vol. v. pp. 1-9. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 481. Comp. further, Reuss, *La Bible Ancien Testament*, 5th part, Paris 1875. Giesebrecht, *Ueber die Abfassungszeit der Psalmen* (*Stade's Zeitsch. für die alttestamentl. Wissensch.* vol. i. 1881, pp. 276-332). Delitzsch in the more recent editions of his commentary on the psalms also admits the existence of several Maccabæan psalms.

The following authorities again take an opposite view: Gesenius in No. 81 of the supplements to the *Allgemeinen Literaturzeitung*, 1816. Haseler, *Comment. crit. de psalmis Maccab.* 2 vols. Ulm 1827-1832. Ewald, *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* vi. 1854, pp. 20-32, viii. 1857, p. 165 sqq. Dillmann, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1858, p. 460 sqq. Hupfeld, *Die Psalmen, übersetzt und ausgelegt*, 4 vols. Gotha 1855-1862. Ebrt, *Abfassungszeit und Abschluss des Psalters zur Prüfung der Frage nach Makkabäerpsalmen historisch-kritisch untersucht*, Leipzig 1869. Wanner, *Etude critique sur les Psaumes*, 44, 74, 79 et 83 considérés par plusieurs théologiens comme provenant de l'époque des Maccabées, Lusanne 1876 (comp. the reviews in the *Revue de théologie et de philosophie*, 1877, p. 399 sq.).

2. The Psalms of Solomon.

In the list of books as given in several copies of the Christian canon of the Old Testament the *ψαλμοὶ Σολομώντος* are also included, and that, in some instances, under the category of *ἀντιλεγόμενα* along with the Books of Maccabees, the Wisdom of Solomon, Jesus the Son of Sirach, Judith, Tobit, etc. (as in the case of the so-called Stichometria of Nicephorus and in the *Synopsis Athanasii*), and in others under the category of *ἀπόκρυφα* along with Enoch, the Patriarchs, Apocalypses of Moses and Ezra, etc. (as in the case of an anonymous list of the canon still extant in various manu-

scripts). From its first-mentioned position we can see that, in the Christian Church, this book was in many quarters regarded as canonical. It is included under the category of *ἀντιλεγόμενα*, simply because, not being in the Hebrew canon, it was not acknowledged to be canonical by those who made that the standard. Besides this there are still in existence several Greek manuscripts of the Bible in which the *Psalms of Solomon* find a place precisely in accordance with the lists just mentioned; and it is just possible that, if the manuscripts of the Septuagint were carefully searched, there might be found to be still more of them than are already known to us. These psalms amount to *eighteen* in number. They were first printed from an Augsburg manuscript by de la Cerda (1626), and subsequently by Fabricius (1713), while, in our own time, an edition, collated with a Vienna manuscript, has been published by Hilgenfeld, whose text is also followed in the editions of Geiger, Fritzsche, and Pick.

The ascribing of these psalms to Solomon is simply due to the later transcribers. The work itself does not lay the slightest claim to such authorship; on the contrary, it betrays very distinct traces of the date of its composition. That certainly was not, as Ewald, Grimm, Oehler, Dillmann (at one time), Weiffenbach, and Anger would have us believe, the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, nor, as Movers, Delitzsch, and Keim suppose, the time of Herod, but, as is now universally admitted,—for example, by Langen, Hilgenfeld, Nöldeke, Geiger, Carriere, Wellhausen, Reuss, Dillmann (now),—the period shortly after the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey. That the psalms were composed at that time may be regarded as absolutely certain from the various explicit indications of this in the *second*, *eighth*, and *seventeenth* psalms. The contemporary state of things which these psalms presuppose is somewhat as follows: A family to which the promise of ruling over Israel had not been given seized the reins of government by force (xvii. 6). They did not give God the glory, but of themselves assumed the king's crown, and took

possession of the throne of David (xvii. 7, 8). In their time the whole of Israel fell into sin. The king despised the law, the judge was unfaithful to truth, and the people lived in sin (xvii. 21, 22). But God overthrew those princes by raising up against them a man from a strange land, and who was not of the race of Israel (xvii. 8, 9). From the ends of the earth God brought one who could strike with a mighty blow, who declared war against Jerusalem and all its territory. The princes of the land in their blindness went out to meet him with joy, and said to him: "Thy approach has been longed for, come hither, enter in peace." They opened the gates to him, so that he entered like a father into the house of his sons (viii. 15-20). But after he had securely established himself in the city he also seized the battlements, and threw down the walls of Jerusalem with the battering-ram (viii. 21, ii. 1). Jerusalem was trodden under foot by the heathen (ii. 20); nay the strange peoples ascended the altar of God itself (ii. 2). All the leading men and every wise man in the council were put to death; and the blood of the inhabitants of Jerusalem was poured out like unclean water (viii. 23). The inhabitants of the land were carried away captive into the *West*, and its princes insulted (xvii. 13, 14, ii. 6, viii. 24). But at last the dragon that had conquered Jerusalem (ii. 29) was itself put to death on the mountains of Egypt by the sea-shore. But his body was allowed to lie unburied (ii. 30, 31). It can scarcely require any further commentary to prove that we are here dealing with the time of the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey, and that it is to it alone that the circumstances presupposed can be said to apply. The princes who had been so arrogant as to assume the rule over Jerusalem and take possession of the throne of David, are the *Hasmonaeans*, who, ever since Aristobulus I., had taken the title of king. The last of the princes of this house, Alexander Jannaeus and Aristobulus II., openly favoured the Sadducean party, so that in the eyes of our author, with his Pharisaic leanings, they appeared in the light

of sinful and lawless men. The "man of the strange land," and "of powerful blows," whom God summons from the end of the earth, is no other than *Pompey*. The princes who go out to meet him are Aristobulus II. and Hyrcanus II. The supporters of this latter opened the gates of the city to Pompey, who then proceeded to take by storm (*ἐν κριῶ*, ii. 1) the other portion of the town in which those belonging to Aristobulus's party had entrenched themselves. All the rest that follows, the contemptuous treading of the temple by the conquerors, the mowing down of the inhabitants, the execution of the leading men among them,⁶ the carrying away of the captives to the West, and of the princes to be mocked (*εἰς ἐμπανηγμόν*, xvii. 14, *i.e.* for the triumphal procession in Rome), corresponds with what actually took place. But it is above all the circumstance of the captives being carried away to the West (xvii. 14) that proves that the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey is alone to be thought of. For the only other case besides this that might possibly be in view is the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus, but to this none of the other circumstances are found to apply.⁷ But if there could be any doubt before, it utterly vanishes when finally we are told that the conqueror was killed on the coast of Egypt, on the sea-shore (*ἐπὶ κυμάτων*), and that his body was left lying without being buried (ii. 31). For this is precisely what actually took place in the case of Pompey (in the year 48 B.C.). Consequently the second psalm was undoubtedly composed soon after this event, while the eighth and seventeenth, as well as most of the others, may be assumed to have been written between the years 63–48. There exists no reason whatever for coming down so late as to the time of Herod. For "the man from the strange land," who, according to xvii. 9, rose up against the Hasmonaeans

⁶ Pa. viii. 23 : ἀπώλυσεν ἀρχοντας αὐτῶν καὶ πάντα σοφὸν ἐν βουλῇ, compare with Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 4. 4 (*Bell. Jud.* i. 7. 6) : τοὺς αἰτίους τοῦ πολέμου τῷ πιλίῳ διεχρήσατο.

⁷ There is above all the circumstance that nowhere in our psalms is there any mention whatever of a *destruction* of the city and the temple.

princes, is, as the context makes it impossible to doubt, the same personage who, according to xvii. 14, carries away the captives to the West, and therefore not Herod, as Movers, Delitzsch, and Keim would have us suppose, but Pompey.

The spirit which the psalms breathe is entirely that of Pharisaic Judaism. They are pervaded by an earnest moral tone and a sincere piety. But the righteousness which they preach and the dearth of which they deplore is, all through, the righteousness that consists in complying with all the Pharisaic prescriptions, the *δικαιοσύνη προσταγμάτων* (xiv. 1). The fate of man after death is represented as depending simply upon his works. It is left entirely in his own option whether he is to decide in favour of righteousness or unrighteousness (comp. especially ix. 7). If he does the former he will rise again to eternal life (iii. 16); if the latter, eternal perdition will be his doom (xiii. 9 sqq., xiv. 2 sqq., xv.) As a contrast to the unlawful rule of the Hasmonaeans, which had been put an end to by Pompey, the author cherishes the confident expectation of that Messianic king of the house of David who is one day to lead Israel to the promised glory (xvii. 1, 5, 23-51, xviii. 6-10. Comp. further vii. 9, xi.).

The view previously held by Grätz, that our psalms are of Christian origin, seems to have been abandoned by that writer himself,⁸ and, in any case, does not call for serious refutation. But neither have we any right to assume that they contain even Christian interpolations. For the sinlessness and holiness which the author ascribes to the Messiah expected by him (xvii. 41, 46), is not sinlessness in the sense of Christian dogmatics, but simply rigid legalism in the Pharisaic sense.

Despite Hilgenfeld's view to the contrary, it is almost universally allowed that the psalms were originally composed in Hebrew. And undoubtedly not without good reason. For the diction of the psalms is so decidedly Hebrew in its character that it is impossible to suppose that they were

⁸ The remark here referred to (*Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iii. 2nd ed. p. 439) is not repeated in the 3rd ed. vol. iii. p. 621.

written originally in Greek. And for this reason it is no less certain that they were not written in Alexandria, but in Palestine. It may not be amiss to mention further the correspondence, to some extent a verbal one, between *Psalm* xi. and the fifth chapter of *Baruch*. If we are correct in supposing that the psalms were written originally in Hebrew, then the imitation must be regarded as being on the part of *Baruch*.

The place assigned to our psalms in the Christian canon: I. Among the ἀντιλεγόμενα: (1) in the Stichometria of Nicephorus as given in Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons* (1847), p. 120, *Nicephori opuscula*, ed. de Boor (Lips. 1880), p. 134. (2) In the *Synopsis Athanasii*, as given in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 144. II. Among the ἀπόκρυφα in an anonymous list of canonical books which has been printed (1) from a certain Codex Coislinianus as given in Montfaucon's *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, Paris 1715, p. 194; (2) from a Parisian manuscript as given in Cotelier's *Patrum apost. Opp.* vol. i. 1698, p. 196; (3) from a certain Codex Baroccianus at Oxford, and as given in Hody's *De Bibliorum textibus*, 1705, p. 649, col. 44; (4) from a Vatican codex as given in Pitra's *Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta*, vol. i. 1864, p. 100 (on the relation of those four texts to each other, see No. V. below, the chapter on the lost Apocalypses). III. In his scholia to the decrees of the Council of Laodicea, Zonaras observes in connection with the 59th canon (Beveregius, *Pandectae canonum*, Oxon. 1672, vol. i. p. 481): ἐκτός τῶν ἡν' ψαλμῶν τοῦ Δαβὶδ εὐρίσκονται καὶ τινες ἕτεροι λεγόμενοι τοῦ Σολομῶντος εἶναι καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν, οὓς καὶ ἰδιωτικοὺς ὠνόμασαν οἱ πατέρες καὶ μὴ λέγεσθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ διατάξαντο. Similarly Balsamon (in Beveregius, i. 480). IV. In the Codex Alexandrinus of the Greek Bible the Psalms of Solomon, as is shown by the list of contents prefixed to the codex, found a place in the Appendix to the New Testament after the Epistles of Clement (see Credner, *Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons*, 1860, p. 238 sq.). In the Vienna manuscript, on the other hand, where the Psalms are still extant, they come in between the Wisdom of Solomon and Jesus the Son of Sirach.

Up to the present time the *manuscripts* that have been found are five in number: (1) The manuscript from which the *editio princeps* of de la Cerdas was printed; it was brought from Constantinople in the year 1615, was in the possession of David Hoeschel, and then found its way to the Augsburg library (Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 973, 914 sq.), but it has now disappeared. (2) A Vienna codex (*cod. gr. theol.* 7), Haupt's collation of which Hilgenfeld made use of in his edition of the Psalms. (3) A Copenhagen manuscript, an account of which is given by Graux in the *Revue Critique*, 1877, No. 46, pp. 291-293. (4) A Moscow manuscript and (5) a Parisian one, both of which were discovered and collated by Gebhardt (see *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1877, p. 627 sq.). The three last-mentioned MSS. have not yet been made use of in any edition of our Psalms.

Editions: (1) De la Cerda, *Adversaria sacra*, Lyons 1626, Appendix. (2) Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti*, vol. i. 1713, pp. 914-999. (3) Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1868, pp. 134-168. Idem, *Messias Judaeorum*, Lips. 1869, pp. 1-33. (4) Eduard Ephraim Geiger, *Der Psalter Salomo's herausgegeben und erklärt*, Augsburg 1871. (5) Fritzsche, *Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti graece*, Lips. 1871, pp. 569-589. (6) Pick, *Presbyterian Review*, 1883, Oct. pp. 775-812. A new edition was prepared by Gebhardt for the "*Texte und Untersuchungen*," edited by himself and Harnack.

German translations with explanatory notes have been published by Geiger as above. Hilgenfeld, *Die Psalmen Salomo's deutsch übersetzt und aufs Neue untersucht* (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1871, pp. 383-418). Wellhausen, *Die Phariseer und die Sadduceer* (1874), pp. 131-164. There is an English translation by Pick as above.

On the circumstances under which our *Psalms* were written: I. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, iv. 392 sq. (subsequently Ewald hit upon the idea of dating the *Psalms* back to the time of Ptolemy Lagus; see the reviews of the writing of Geiger and Carriere in the *Göttinger gel. Anzeigen*, 1871, pp. 841-850, and 1873, pp. 237-240). Grimm, *Exeget. Handbuch zu 1 Makk.* p. 27. Oehler, art. "*Messias*," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. ix. 426 sq. Dillmann, art. "*Pseudepigraphen*," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xii. 305 sq. Weiffenbach, *Quae Jesu in regno coelesti dignitas sit synopticorum sententia exponitur* (Gissae, 1868), p. 49 sq. Anger, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der messianischen Idee* (1873), p. 81 sq. II. Movers in Wetzer und Welte's *Kirchenlex.* 1st ed. i. 340. Delitzsch, *Commentar über den Psalter*, 1st ed. ii. 381 sq. Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara*, i. 243. III. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 64-70. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr.* 1868, *Messias Judaeorum proleg.*, *Zeitschr.* 1871. Nöldeke, *Die alttestamentl. Literatur* (1868), p. 141 sq. Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. i. pp. 157 sq., 168. Geiger in his edition of our *Psalms*. Fritzsche, *prolegom.* to his edition. Wittichen, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes* (1872), pp. 155-160. Carriere, *De psalterio Salomonis*, Argentorati 1870. Wellhausen, *Die Phariseer und die Sadduceer*, p. 112 sqq. Stähelin, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1874, p. 203. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (1877), pp. 133-142. Kaulen in Wetzer und Welte's *Kirchenlex.* 2nd ed. i. 1060 sq. Lucius, *Der Essenismus* (1881), pp. 119-121. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, § 526. Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. xii. 1883, p. 346. Pick, *The Psalter of Solomon* (*Presbyterian Review*, 1883, Oct. pp. 775-812).

III. THE GNOMIC WISDOM.

1. *Jesus the Son of Sirach.*

There is nothing that shows so clearly the practical character of the Palestinian Jewish literature of our period, as the fact

that even in the *merely theoretical speculations* of the time there was always an eye to the practical aims and tasks of life. A theoretical philosophy strictly so called was a thing entirely foreign to genuine Judaism. Whatever it did happen to produce in the way of "*philosophy*" (= *wisdom*, חֵכְמָה) either had practical religious problems as its theme (Job, Ecclesiastes), or was of a directly practical nature, being: *directions based upon a thoughtful study of human things for so regulating our life as to ensure our being truly happy*. The form in which those contemplations and instructions were presented was that of the *שֵׁנִי*, the *apothegm*, which contained a single thought expressed in concise and comprehensive terms, and in a form more or less poetical, and in which there was nothing of the nature of discussion or argument. A collection of aphorisms of this sort had already found a place among the canonical writings of the Old Testament in the shape of the so-called proverbs of Solomon. We have a collection of a similar character in the book known as *Jesus the Son of Sirach*, and which we now proceed to consider. This book takes that older collection as its model, not only as regards the form, but the matter as well, though it contributes a large number of new and original thoughts. The fundamental thought of the author is that of *wisdom*. For him the highest and most perfect wisdom resides only in God, who has established and who continues to govern all things in accordance with His marvellous knowledge and understanding. On the part of man, therefore, true wisdom consists in his trusting and obeying God. The fear of God is the beginning and end of all wisdom. Hence it is that the author, living as he did at a time when the fear of God and the observance of the law were already regarded as one and the same thing, inculcates above all the duty of adhering faithfully to the law and keeping the commandments. But besides this he also points out in the next place how the truly wise man is to comport himself in the manifold relationships of practical life. And accordingly his book contains an inexhaustible fund of rules

for the regulation of one's conduct in joy and sorrow, in prosperity and adversity, in sickness and in health, in struggle and temptation, in social life, in intercourse with friends and enemies, with high and low, rich and poor, with the good and the wicked, the wise and the foolish, in trade, business and one's ordinary calling, above all, in one's own house and family in connection with the training of children, the treatment of men-servants and maid-servants, and the way in which a man ought to behave toward his own wife and the fair sex generally. For all those manifold relationships the most precise directions are furnished, directions that are prompted by a spirit of moral earnestness which only now and then degenerates into mere worldly prudence. The counsels of the author are the mature fruit of a profound and comprehensive study of human things and of a wide experience of life. In entering as they do into such a multiplicity of details, they at the same time furnish us with a lively picture of the manners and customs and of the culture generally of his time and his people. How far the thoughts expressed, as well as the form in which they are expressed, were the author's own, and how far he only collected what was already in current and popular use it is of course impossible in any particular instance to determine. To a certain extent he may have done both. But in any case he was not a mere collector or compiler, the characteristic personality of the author stands out far too distinctly and prominently for that. Notwithstanding the diversified character of the apothegms, they are all the outcome of one connected view of life and the world.

At the close of the book, chap. L. 27, the author calls himself Ἰησοῦς υἱὸς Σιράχ ὁ Ἱεροσολυμίτης. Many manuscripts insert Ἐλεάζαρ after Σιράχ; but this, despite the strong testimony in its favour, must be regarded as a gloss (see Fritzsche's edition and commentary). The name Σιράχ is equivalent to the Hebrew כִּי־רָ, "a coat of mail" (the accent being on the final syllable as in ἀκελδαμάχ, Acts i. 19). The singular mistake of Syncellus (*Chron.* ed. Dindorf, i. 525),

who alleges that he was a high priest, can only have arisen from the fact that in the chronicle of Eusebius, which Syncellus makes use of, our Jesus the Son of Sirach is mentioned after the high priest, Simon the son of Onias II., though not as a high priest, but only as the author of the book now under consideration (Euseb. *Chron. ad Ol.* 137-38, ed. Schoene, ii. 122). Again, the notion that he was an ordinary priest is also entirely without foundation, notwithstanding the fact that it has found expression in the text of the *cod. Sinaiticus*, L. 27. The *time* at which he lived may be determined with tolerable precision. His *grandson*, who translated the book into Greek, states in the prologue prefixed to it that he (the grandson) came to Egypt *ἐν τῇ ὀγδόῃ καὶ τριακοστῇ ἔτει ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐεργέτου βασιλέως*. By the "thirty-eighth year" he, of course, does not mean that of his own age, but the thirty-eighth year of the reign of Euergetes. Now seeing that of the two Ptolemys who bore this surname, the one reigned only twenty-five years, it is only the second that can be intended, and whose full name was Ptolemaeus VII. Physcon Euergetes II. This latter in the first instance shared the throne along with his brother (from the year 170 onwards), and subsequently reigned alone (from the year 145 onwards). But he was in the habit of reckoning the years of his reign from the former of those dates. Consequently that thirty-eighth year in which the grandson of Jesus the son of Sirach came to Egypt would be the year 132 B.C. That being the case, his grandfather may be supposed to have lived and to have written his book somewhere between 190 and 170 B.C. This further accords with the fact that in the book (l. 1-26) he pays a respectful tribute to the memory of the high priest, Simon the son of Onias, by whom we are to understand, not Simon I. (in the beginning of the third century, see Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 2. 4), but Simon II. (in the beginning of the second century, see Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 4. 10). Jesus the son of Sirach passes an encomium upon the meritorious character of this personage, who had just passed

away from the world, and the thought of whom was still so fresh in his memory.

The book has come down to us only in the form of the Greek translation which, according to the prologue, was executed by the author's grandson. We further learn from this prologue what is also confirmed by the character of the diction, that the work was originally *composed in Hebrew*, by which we are to understand Hebrew strictly so called and not Aramaic (see Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handbuch*, p. 18). The Hebrew text was still in existence in the time of Jerome, who tells us that he had seen it, see *Præf. in vers. libr. Salom.* (Vallarsi, ix. 1293 sq.): Fertur et *πανάρετος* Jesu filii Sirach liber et alius *ψευδενίγραφος*, qui Sapiencia Salomonis inscribitur. Quorum priorem Hebraicum reperi, non Ecclesiasticum, ut apud Latinos, sed Parabolas prænotatum, cui juncti erant Ecclesiastes et Canticum Canticorum, ut similitudinem Salomonis non solum librorum numero, sed etiam materiarum genere coequaret.

The fact that a Hebrew text was still extant in the time of Jerome is evidence of itself that the book was also prized within the circle of Rabbinical Judaism. Not only so, but quotations from it are repeatedly met with in Talmudic literature. But it was prized far more highly still within the Christian Church. It is frequently quoted as *γραφή* by the Greek and the Latin Fathers alike, and that too in the form in which it has come down to us in the manuscripts of the Bible. The restricting of the Christian canon to precisely the same number of books as was in the Hebrew Bible was, in the early Church and that of the Middle Ages, almost always a pure matter of theory, and was only practically recognised and acted upon for the first time in the Protestant Church.

On the quotations from *בן סירא* in Talmudic literature, see Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, i. 257 sqq. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 101 sqq. Delitzsch, *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie*, pp. 20 sq., 204 sq. Dukes, *Rabbinische Blumenlese*, p. 67 sqq. Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handbuch*, p. xxxvii. Joel, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte* (1880), p. 71 sqq. Strack in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vii. 430 sq. We must beware of confounding

with those quotations the very late and apocryphal *Alphabet of Ben Sira*, a collection of 44 (2 × 22) sayings arranged in alphabetical order. On this see Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, i. 260 sqq., iii. 156 sq. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* iii. 726 sq. Steinschneider, *Catalogus librorum Hebraeorum in bibliotheca Bodleiana* (1852-1860), col. 203-205. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 341. Modern edition, *Alphabetum Siracidis utrumque*, ed. Steinschneider, Berlin 1858.

On the title of our book, see in particular the passage from Jerome quoted above. In the manuscripts it runs thus: *Σοφία Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σιράχ*. In the Greek Church the designation *ἡ παράκλητος σοφία*, which according to Euseb., *Hist. eccl.* iv. 22. 8, was in the first instance usually applied to the proverbs of Solomon, came to be extended to our book as well. So for the first time Eusebius, *Chron.* ed. Schoene, ii. 422 (where the conformity on the part of Syncellus and Jerome with the Armenian text serves to show that the expression is peculiar to Eusebius himself). *Demonstr. evang.* viii. 2. 71, ed. Gaisford: *Σίμων, καθ' ὃν Ἰησοῦς ὁ τοῦ Σιράχ ἐγνωρίζετο, ὁ τὴν καλουμένην παράκλητον Σοφίαν ἐννείξας*. This designation does not occur as yet in connection with any of the numerous quotations in Clement and Origen. In the Latin Church *Ecclesiasticus* came to be adopted as the regular title of the book (Cyprian, *Testimon.* ii. 1, iii. 1, 85, 51, 95, 96, 97, 109, 110, 111). Comp. the Latin translation of Origen, *In Numer. homil.* xviii. 3 (ed. Lommatzsch, x. 221): *In libro qui apud nos quidem inter Salomonis volumina haberi solet et Ecclesiasticus dici, apud Graecos vero sapientia Jesu filii Sirach appellatur*.

The use of the book in the Christian Church begins with the New Testament itself. In the Epistle of James, above all, there are unmistakeable reminiscences of it. See in general, Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, pp. 337 sq., 344-348. Werner, *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1872, p. 265 sqq. The express quotations begin with Clement of Alexandria, who quotes our book times without number, and on most occasions using either the formula *ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, φησὶν* and such like (thirteen times: *Paedag.* i. 8. 62, 8. 68, ii. 2. 34, 5. 46, 8. 69, 8. 76, 10. 98, 10. 99, iii. 3. 17, 3. 23, 4. 29, 11. 58, 11. 83), or *ἡ σοφία λέγει, φησὶν* and such like (nine times: *Paedeg.* i. 8. 69, 8. 72, 9. 75, ii. 1. 8, 2. 24, 7. 54, 7. 58, 7. 59; *Strom.* v. 3. 18); or further, quoting passages now and again as the words of the *παιδαγωγός* (*Paedag.* ii. 10. 99, 101. 109). He speaks of the book as the *σοφία Ἰησοῦ* only twice (*Strom.* i. 4. 27, 10. 47). On one occasion he appears to call Solomon the author (*Strom.* ii. 5. 24); the quotation however is somewhat uncertain. In one instance again an expression in our *σοφία* is described as Sophoclean (*Paedag.* ii. 2. 24). It is very much the same with regard to the quotations in Origen, only here it is impossible in many instances to make out the exact formulae made use of, seeing that the majority of Origen's writings are extant only in Latin translations. Like Clement he also appears to have quoted the book most frequently as *γραφὴ*. In the Latin text Solomon is several times spoken of as the author (*In Numer. homil.* xviii. 3 = Lommatzsch, x. 221; *In Josuam homil.* xi. 2 = Lommatzsch, xi. 108; *In Samuel. homil.* i. 13 = Lommatzsch, xi. 811). But that this cannot be taken as representing the opinion of Origen himself is

proved by the following passage in *contra Cels.* vi. 7 (ed. Lommatzsch, xix. 312): *παρουδείξμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων, ὅτι προτρίψι καὶ ὁ θεὸς λόγος ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ διαλεκτικῇν ὅπου μὲν Σολομώντος λόγοντος . . . ὅπου δὲ τοῦ τοῦ σύγγραμματος τὴν σοφίαν [i. τῆς σοφίας] ἡμῖν καταλιπόντος; Ἰησοῦ υἱοῦ Σιραχ φάσκοντος.* Cyprian uniformly quotes our book as being a work of Solomon's quite as much as any of the rest of his writings (*Testimon.* ii. 1, iii. 6. 12, 35, 51, 53, 95, 96, 97, 109, 113; *Ad Fortunatum*, chap. ix.; *De opere et eleemosynis*, chap. v.; *Epist.* iii. 2). Similarly other Latin writers. See especially the passage quoted above from the Latin version of Origen, *In Numer. homil.* xviii. 3 (Lommatzsch, x. 221), and also Jerome who, in his *Comment. in Daniel.* chap. ix. (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, v. 686), reproduces the passage from Euseb. *Demonstr. evang.* viii. 2. 71, as follows: Simon, quo regente populum Jesus filius Sirach scripsit librum, qui Graece *παναπερτές*, appellatur et plerisque Salomonis falso dicitur. On the further history of the use of the book in this way, comp. the works and dissertations devoted to the history of the Old Testament canon, also Jahn's *Einleitung in die göttl. Bücher des A. B.* 2nd ed. vol. ii. § 3 and 4 (1803), 1st and 2nd appendices, as well as my article in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 485-489.

The most important manuscripts are: (1) The *Vaticanus*, 1209, i.e. the famous Vatican manuscript of the Bible, which however, if we except the eclectic use made of it in the Sixtine edition, has not as yet been made available for the criticism of the text in connection with any edition of our book, not even that of Fritzsche (comp. p. 10). (2) The *Sinaiticus*, in Fritzsche's edition marked No. x. (3) The *Alexandrinus*, in Fritzsche, as in Holmes and Parsons before him, marked No. iii. (4) The fragments of the *Codex Ephraemi*, in Fritzsche = C. (5) A *Venetian codex*, in Fritzsche, who, following Holmes and Parsons, marks it No. xxiii. For further information regarding these manuscripts, see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 489-491.

On the editions, see p. 10, and Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 494 sq. Separate edition: *Liber Jesu Siracidae Graece, ad fidem codicum et versionum emendatus et perpetua annotatione illustratus a C. G. Bretschneider*, Ratisb. 1806. For further separate editions, see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 495.

Of the early translations the following may be specially mentioned: (1) The old Latin one which Jerome did not revise (*praef. in edit. librorum Salomonis juxta Sept. interpretes* [Vallarsi, x. 436]: Porro in eo libro qui a plerisque Sapiencia Salomonis inscribitur et in Ecclesiastico, quem esse Jesu filii Sirach nullus ignorat, calamo temperavi, tantummodo canonicas scripturas vobis emendare desiderans. It found its way into the Vulgate, and hence it came to be printed in all subsequent editions of this latter. The variations of four manuscripts (for Jesus the Son of Sirach as well as for the Wisdom of Solomon) are given by Sabatier in his *Bibliorum sacrorum versiones antiquae*, vol. ii. Remis 1748. The text of the *Codex Amiatinus* has been published (for those two books also) by Lagarde in his *Mittelungen*, 1884. (2) The two Syrian versions: (a) The Peshito or the Syrian received text, on the editions of which comp. p. 11; (b) the *Syrus hexaplaris* which, for our book as well as for the Wisdom of

Solomon, was edited for the first time from a Milan manuscript by Carpi, *Codex Syro-Hezaplaris, Ambrosianus photolithographice editus*, Mediol. 1874 (forming vol. vii. of the *Monum. Sacra et prof.*). For more on the early versions, see Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 491-494. Also texts in the London *Polyglot*, vol. iv.

For the *ezegetical aids* generally, see p. 11. *Commentaries*: Bretschneider in the separate edition previously mentioned. Fritzsche, *Die Weisheit Jesus Sirach's erklärt und übersetzt (Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen, 5 Thl.)*, Leipzig 1859. For the earlier literature, see Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, iii. 718 sqq. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 841 sq. Fritzsche, p. xl. Herzog's *Real-Enc.* i. 496.

Special disquisitions: Gfrörer, *Philo*, vol. ii. (1831) pp. 18-52. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie*, vol. ii. (1834) pp. 126-150. Winer, *De utriusque Siracidae aetate*, Erlang. 1832. Comp. also Winer's *Realwörth.*, art. "Jesus Sirach." Zuntz, *Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden* (1882), pp. 100-105. Ewald, "Ueber das griech. Spruchbuch Jesus' Sohnes Sirach's" (*Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* vol. iii. 1851, pp. 125-140). Bruch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, 1851, pp. 266-319. Geiger, *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* xii. 1858, pp. 536-543. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 340 sqq. Horowitz, *Das Buch Jesus Sirach*, Breslau 1865. Fritzsche in Schenkal's *Bibellez.* iii. 252 sqq. Grätz, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1872, pp. 49 sqq., 97 sqq. Merguet, *Die Glaubens- und Sittenlehre des Buches Jesus Sirach*, Königsberg 1874. Seligmann, *Das Buch der Weisheit des Jesus Sirach (Josua ben Sira) in seinem Verhältnis zu den salomonischen Sprüchen und seiner historischen Bedeutung*, Breslau 1883. The various introductions of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, Nöldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see p. 12).

2. *The Pirke Aboth.*

Nor did the gnomic wisdom become extinct in the period following that of Jesus the son of Sirach. Jesus Christ Himself indeed frequently clothed His teaching in this aphoristic form. But besides the work we have just been considering, there is still extant, and that in Hebrew, a collection of such proverbial sayings as we have referred to above, and which, so far at least as its substratum is concerned, belongs to our period, we mean the so-called *Pirke Aboth* (פְּרִקֵּי אֲבוֹת, *sayings of the fathers*), known also under the abbreviated form of *Aboth*. This collection was inserted among the tractates of the Mishna (among those of the fourth

division), though strictly speaking it is quite out of place there. For while the rest of the Mishna is simply a codification of Jewish law, our tractate contains a collection of aphorisms after the manner of Jesus the son of Sirach. The only difference is that the *Pirke Aboth* is not the work of a single individual like that book, but a collection of sayings by some sixty learned doctors, who are mentioned by name. The majority of these latter are also otherwise known as distinguished doctors of the law. As a rule each doctor is represented in the work by a couple or more of his characteristic maxims, such as he had been in the habit of inculcating upon his disciples and contemporaries as rules of life well worthy of special consideration. Many of those maxims are of a purely utilitarian character, but the most of them are related in some way or other to the domain of religion; and it is extremely significant as regards the characteristic tendency of this later age that here the importance and necessity of the study of the law are inculcated with quite a special emphasis (comp. the specimens given at Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 44). The authorities whose utterances were collected in this fashion belong for the most part to the age of the Mishna, *i.e.* to the period extending from the year 70 to 170 A.D. Besides these a few, but only a few, of the authorities belonging to earlier times are also taken notice of. The tractate consists of five chapters. In many editions a sixth chapter is added, but it is of much later origin.

Our tractate is given in every edition of the Mishna (on this see § iii. above). In the edition of the Mishna published under Jost's supervision by Lewent in Berlin 1832-1834, there is an excellent German translation printed in the Hebrew character. There is also a Latin version in Surenhusius, *Mishna*, etc. vol. iv. 1702, pp. 409-484. Of the numerous *separate editions* (some of them accompanied with translations) the following may be specially mentioned: P Ewald, *Pirke Aboth oder Sprüche der Vater, übersetzt und erklärt*, Erlangen 1825. Cahn, *Pirke Aboth, sprachlich und sachlich erläutert, erster Perek* (all that has been published), Berlin 1875. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, comprising *Pirke Aboth* and *Perek R. Meir* in Hebrew and English, with critical and illustrative notes, etc., Cambridge 1877 (where the text is given exactly in accordance with a

Cambridge manuscript, *University Addit.* 470. 1). Strack, פירקי אבות, *Die Sprüche der Väter, ein ethischer Mischna-Traktat, mit kurzer Einleitung, Anmerkungen und einem Wortregister*, 1882 (where additional literature is to be found in the introduction).

IV. HORTATORY NARRATIVE.

1. *The Book of Judith.*

The hortatory narrative was a peculiar species of literature which was frequently cultivated during our period. Stories of a purely fictitious character were composed which the author no doubt intended to be regarded as founded on fact, though at the same time the object in view was not so much to impart historical information, as to use these stories as a vehicle for conveying moral and religious lessons and exhortations. From the incidents narrated—and which are taken from the history of the Jewish people, or from the life of certain individuals—the readers are expected to learn the truth that the fear of God is after all the highest wisdom, for God always delivers His children in some wonderful way in the end, although for a little He may bring them into circumstances of trouble and danger.

The history of Judith is a narrative of this description. The following is an outline of the story. Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Assyria (*sic* !), calls upon the peoples of Asia Minor, and among them the inhabitants of Palestine, to furnish him with troops to help him in the war he was waging against Arphaxad the king of Media. As those who received this summons did not think proper to comply with it, Nebuchadnezzar, as soon as he had vanquished Arphaxad, sent his general, Holofernes, with a large force against the nations of the West, with the view of chastising them for their disobedience. Holofernes executes his orders, devastates the various countries one after another, and demolishes their sanctuaries in order that Nebuchadnezzar alone might receive the worship due to God (i.-iii.). When he got as far as the

plain of Esdrelon, the Jews, who had just returned from the captivity, and had newly re-established their worship (*sic!* in Nebuchadnezzar's time), prepare to offer resistance. By order of Joakim, the high priest, they intercept Holofernes on his way to Jerusalem at Fort Betylua (*Βετυλούα*; Latin, Bethulia), opposite the plain of Esdrelon (iv.—vi.).⁹ Now when Holofernes was besieging Betylua, and the distress within the town had reached a climax, a wealthy, beautiful, and pious widow called Judith resolved to save her people by an act of daring (vii.—ix.). Richly attired, and having no one with her but a bondwoman, she betakes herself to the enemy's camp, and there, under the pretext of wishing to show him how to get to Jerusalem, she contrives to obtain an interview with Holofernes. This latter reposes confidence in her, and is charmed with her beauty. After spending three days in the camp she is called upon to be present at a banquet, at the conclusion of which she is left alone with Holofernes in his tent. But the general is so intoxicated with wine that Judith now finds an opportunity for carrying out her design. She accordingly takes Holofernes's own sword and cuts off his head with it. She then manages to get away from the camp without being observed, while the slave brings away the head of Holofernes in a bag. Having thus accomplished her object,

⁹ The town of *Βετυλούα* (Bethulia) is mentioned nowhere else (except by Christian pilgrims who, on the ground of our story, point sometimes to one place and sometimes to another, as the spot where it stood). That the town actually existed however is hardly to be doubted, for it is scarcely likely that the author would also have to invent an artificial geography to suit his story. On the probable site of the place, see Robinson's *Palestine*, iii. pp. 387 sq. Idem, *Modern Biblical Researches*, p. 443. Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellx.* i. 431. Guérin, *Samarie*, i. pp. 344–350. The Palestine pilgrim Theodosius (ed. Gildemeister, 1882) speaks in § xx. of Betulia, *ubi Olofernes mortuus est*, as being in the extreme south of Palestine, twelve miles south of Raphia. There no doubt a place of this name must have existed (see Wesseling, *Vetere Romanorum itineraria*, p. 719. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerliche Verfassung des römischen Reichs*, ii. 367 sq. Gildemeister's notes to Theodosius). But this cannot have been the locality in question, for our Betylua must have been much farther north, *viz.* in Samaria.

she returns to Betylua, where she is welcomed with great rejoicings (x.—xiii.). When the enemy discovered what had been done they fled in all directions, and were without difficulty mown down by the Jews. But Judith was extolled by all Israel as their deliverer (xiv.—xvi.).

As our book happens to have found a place in the Christian Bible, not only Catholic but also many Protestant theologians have felt it to be their duty to defend the historical character of the narrative (as was still done, on the Protestant side, above all by O. Wolff, 1861). But the historical blunders are so gross, and the hortatory purpose so obvious, that one cannot venture to assume even a nucleus of fact. The book is a piece of fiction composed with the view of encouraging the people to offer a brave resistance to the enemies of their religion and their liberties. The standpoint of the author is already entirely that of Pharisaic legalism. It is precisely the scrupulous care with which she observes the laws regarding purifications and meats that is so much admired in Judith, while it is plainly enough intimated that it was just for this reason that she had had God upon her side. But the story points to a time when danger threatened not only the people themselves, but their religion as well. For Holofernes demands that Nebuchadnezzar should be worshipped instead of God. This is suggestive of Daniel and the Maccabean age. Consequently the origin of the book may with great probability be referred to this period (so also Fritzsche, for example, and Ewald, Hilgenfeld 1861, Nöldeke). Seeing that the author appears to be quite as deeply interested in political as in religious liberty, probably we ought to understand him as referring, not to the earlier days of the insurrection, but to a somewhat later period. It would hardly be advisable to come so far down as the Roman age, for the political background (the high priest as supreme head of the Jewish commonwealth, the Hellenistic cities as independent towns, and subject to the suzerain only to the extent of having to furnish troops in time of war) corresponds far more with the Greek

than the Roman period. It is entirely out of the question to refer the composition of the book to the time of Trajan (so Hitzig, Grätz, and above all Volkmar, who finds in it a disguised account of Trajan's campaigns); for the story of Judith was already known to Clement of Rome (toward the end of the first century of our era).

Jerome had the book before him in a Chaldee text (see below). How far this agreed with or differed from our Greek text we are not in a position to say exactly, for we have no means of knowing to what extent Jerome followed the Chaldee text when he was preparing the Latin one. In any case, judging from internal grounds, it is tolerably certain—and moreover almost universally acknowledged—that our Greek text is a translation of a Hebrew (or Aramaic) original (see Movers in the article mentioned below, and Fritzsche, *Handb.* p. 115 sq.).

In the time of Origen the book was not in use among the (Palestinian) Jews, nor was any Hebrew text of it known to exist, for in *Epist. ad African.* chap. xiii. he says: 'Εβραῖοι τῇ Τωβίᾳ οὐ χρῶνται οὐδὲ τῇ Ἰουδῇ ὡδὲ γὰρ ἔχουσιν αὐτὰ ἐν ἀποκρύφοις ἰσραηλιτῶν ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν μαθηταὶ ἐγνώκαντες. It may therefore be conjectured that the Hebrew original was lost at an early period, and that the Chaldee text, with which Jerome was acquainted, was a later version based upon the Greek one. For yet later Jewish versions, see Zunz, *Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden*, p. 124 sq. Lipsius, "Jüdische Quellen zur Judithsage" (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1867, pp. 337–366).

Use in the Christian Church: Clement of Rome, chap. lv.: Ἰουδὴ ἡ μακαρία. Tertullian, *De monogam.* chap. xvii.: Nec Joannes aliqui Christi spado, nec Judith filia Merari nec tot alia exempla sanctorum (!). Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* ii. 7. 35, iv. 19. 118 (Judith being expressly mentioned in the latter passage). Origen, *Fragm. ex libro sexto Stromatum*, in Jerome, *adv. Rufin.* Book I. (Lommatzsch, xvii. 69 sq.): Homo autem, cui incumbit necessitas mentiendi, diligenter attendat, ut sic utatur interdum mendacio, quomodo condimento atque medicamine; ut servet mensuram ejus, ne excedat terminos, quibus usa est Judith contra Holophernem et vicit eum prudenti simulatione verborum. Further quotations in Origen are to be found: *Comm. in Joann.* vol. ii. chap. xvi. (Lommatzsch, xi. 279). In *Lib. Judic. homil.* ix. 1 (Lommatzsch, xi. 279); *De Oratione*, chap. xiii. (Lommatzsch, xvii. 134); *De Oratione*, chap. xxix. (Lommatzsch, xvii. 246). For the further history of the use, see the history of the canon.

The Greek text exists in three different recensions: (1) The original text, which is that given in the majority of manuscripts, and among others also

in the Codex Vaticanus (marked in the critical apparatuses as No. ii.), Alexandrinus (No. iii.) and Sinaiticus (No. x.). (2) A revised text, viz. that of Codex 58 (according to numbering of the manuscripts in Holmes and Parsons). It is on this text also that the Latin and Syriac versions are based. (3) Another recension, though akin to the one just mentioned, is to be found in Codices 19 and 108. *On the editions*, see p. 10.

Of the *early versions* the following call for special mention in the case of our book as well: (1) The *Latin*, and that (a) the *Vetus Latinus* (previous to Jerome), for which Sabatier collated five manuscripts, in which the deviations from each other are found to be so great as entirely to corroborate what Jerome says about the *multorum codicum varietas vitiosissima* in his day (Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. i. Remis 1743, pp. 744-790). On the relation of the texts to one another and to the Greek text, see Fritzsche's *Commentar*, p. 118 sqq. (b) Jerome's translation (=Vulgata), on the origin of which he himself says in the preface (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, x. 21 sq.): *Apud Hebraeos liber Judith inter apocrypha (al. hagiographa) legitur . . . Chaldaeo tamen sermone conscriptus inter historias computatur. Sed quia hunc librum Synodus Nicaena in numero sanctarum scripturarum legitur computasse, acquievi postulationi vestrae, immo exactioni, et sepositis occupationibus, quibus vehementer arctabar, huic unam lucubratiunculam dedi, magis sensum e sensu quam ex verbo verbum transferens. Multorum codicum varietatem vitiosissimam amputavi: sola ea, quae intelligentia integra in verbis Chaldaeis invenire potui, Latinis expressi.* According to this, his own confession, the work is a free rendering and one too that was executed somewhat hurriedly. It was based upon the old Latin version. Comp. Fritzsche's *Commentar*, p. 121 sq. For the criticism of the text, see Thielmann, *Beiträge zur Textkritik der Vulgata, insbesondere des Buches Judith*, a school program, Speier 1883. (2) *The Syriac Version*, on which and its editions see p. 11. The London Polyglot gives, in addition to the Greek text, only the Latin Vulgate and the Syriac version.

For the *exegetical aids* generally, see p. 11. Commentaries: Fritzsche, *Die Bücher Tobi und Judith erklärt (Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, 2 vols.), Leipzig 1853. O. Wolff, *Das Buch Judith als geschichtliche Urkunde vertheidigt und erklärt*, Leipzig 1861. The older literature in Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, iii. 736-738. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, ii. 51 (under "Jehudit"). Volkmar, *Handb. der Einkl. in die Apokryphen*, i. 1 (1860), pp. 3-5. Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 496.

Special disquisitions: Montfaucon, *La vérité de l'histoire de Judith*, Paris 1690. Movers, "Ueber die Ursprache der deuterokanonischen Bücher des A. T." (*Zeitschr. für Philos. und kathol. Theol.*, Part 13, 1835, p. 31 sqq. [on Judith exclusively]). Schoenhaupt, *Etudes historiques et critiques sur le livre de Judith*, Strasb. 1839. Reuss, art. "Judith," in Erach and Gruber's *Allg. Enc.* § ii. vol. xxviii. (1851) p. 98 sqq. Nickes, *De libro Judithae*, Vratislav. 1854. *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*, vol. iii. 1856, pp. 342-363, vol. xii. 1861, pp. 421-440. Volkmar, "Die Composition des Buches Judith" (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1857, pp. 441-498). Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1858 p. 270-281. R. A.

Lipsius, *ibid.* 1859, pp. 99-121. Hitzig, *ibid.* 1860, pp. 240-250. Volkmar, *Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apokryphen*, Part 1, Div. 1, Judith, 1860. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.* 1861, pp. 335-385. K. H. A. Lipsius, "Sprachliches zum Buche Judith" (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.* 1862, pp. 103-105). Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iv. (3rd ed. 1864) p. 618 sq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iv. (2nd ed. 1866) note 14, p. 439 sqq. R. A. Lipsius, "Judische Quellen zur Judithsage" (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1867, pp. 337-366). Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* iii. 445 sqq. The introductions of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, Noldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see p. 12).

2. *The Book of Tobit.*

The Book of Tobit is a work of a similar character to that of Judith, only it does not move in the domain of political history, but in that of biography, though like it it addresses its exhortations not to the people at large, but to the individual reader. Tobit, the son of Tobiel, of the tribe of Naphtali, who, in the days of Shalmaneser king of Assyria, had been taken captive to Nineveh, relates how, both before and after going into captivity, even under the succeeding kings Sennacherib and Esarhaddon, he, and his wife Anna, and his son Tobias, had always lived in strict accordance with the requirements of the law. Besides this he had been particularly in the habit of interring the bodies of such of his countrymen as had been put to death by the Assyrians and allowed to lie unburied. One day, after performing a kind service of this sort, he lay down to sleep in the open air (in order that, defiled as he was by contact with a dead body, he might not communicate the defilement to his house), when some sparrow's dung fell upon his eyes, in consequence of which he lost his sight (i.-iii. 6). At the same time there was living in Ecbatana in Media a pious Jewess called Sarah, the daughter of Raguel, who already had had seven husbands, but all of whom had been put to death on the marriage night by the evil spirit Asmodeus (iii. 7-17). Meanwhile the aged Tobit remembered, in the midst of his distress, that on one occasion he had left ten talents of silver at Rages in Media, in charge

of one Gabael a member of his own tribe. Consequently when he saw that his end was approaching he sent his son Tobias to Rages with instructions to get the money, which he was to retain as his patrimony. Tobias sets out, taking with him a fellow-traveller, this latter however being, in reality, no other than the angel Raphael (iv.-v.). On his way Tobias bathes in the Tigris and, while doing so, he catches a fish. At the angel's behest he takes out the fish's heart, liver and gall, and carries them away with him. Having now reached Ecbatana they take up their quarters at the house of Raguel. This latter recognises in Tobias one of her own relations and gives him her daughter Sarah to be his wife. As soon as the new-married couple had entered the bride-chamber, Tobias, acting on the instructions of the angel, raises a smoke by burning the heart and the liver of the fish, which had the effect of expelling the demon Asmodeus, who was bent on disposing of him too precisely as he had disposed of the former husbands of Sarah. Thus the fourteen days of marriage festivity were allowed to pass by without disturbance or interruption, the angel having meanwhile taken the opportunity to go to Rages to get the money from Gabael (vi.-ix.). After the marriage celebrations were over Tobias returns to Nineveh to his parents accompanied by Sarah his wife, and there he contrives to cure his father's blindness by anointing his eyes with the gall of the fish (x.-xii.). Full of gratitude to God, Tobit chants a song of praise, and continues to live for nearly a hundred years longer. Tobias also lives to the age of 127 years (xiii.-xiv.).

The plot of the story is well contrived, there is great variety of details, and the various threads joined on at different points in the narrative are skilfully interwoven with each other. Consequently as a literary product our book is decidedly superior to that of Judith. But the religious standpoint is exactly the same. Here too, as in Judith, the whole stress is laid upon the strict observance of the law, of which the practice of deeds of kindness also forms a part.

And in connection with this, we at the same time get some instructive glimpses of the superstition of the time. As the whole story centres in the dispersion, it would seem from this that the author wrote mainly for the *Jews of the dispersion*. By holding up those patterns of excellence before the eyes of his readers he hopes to produce such an impression upon the minds of those of his countrymen scattered among the Gentiles as may lead them to adhere no less faithfully to the law, and to observe it in an equally strict and conscientious manner. In consequence of the purpose of the book being as here described, it is impossible to determine whether it had its origin in Palestine or in the dispersion.

The date of the composition of the work can only be fixed within tolerably wide limits. Comparatively speaking, it may be regarded as most certain of all that the book was written *previous to the building of the temple of Herod*. No doubt Hitzig thought (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1860, p. 250 sqq.) that we were bound to assume that it was written after the destruction of the temple by Titus, because among the predictions at the close of the book it is above all foretold that the temple will be rebuilt again with great magnificence (xiii. 16 f., xiv. 4, 5). But on more careful consideration we will find it probable that the author wrote when the temple of Zerubbabel was still standing. He places himself at the standpoint of the Assyrian age, and from this he predicts first of all the destruction of the temple by the Chaldeans, and then its reconstruction, where however he distinguishes between two things: (1) the restoration of an unpretending structure till the lapse of a definite period; and (2) the rebuilding with extraordinary magnificence and splendour that is to take place at the expiry of this period (xiv. 5: *καὶ οἰκοδομήσουσι τὸν οἶκον, οὐχ ὅσος ὁ πρότερος, ἕως πληρωθῶσι καιροὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπιστρέψουσιν ἐκ τῶν αἰχμαλωσιῶν καὶ οἰκοδομήσουσιν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐντίμως· καὶ ὁ οἶκος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος οἰκοδομῇ ἐνδόξῃ, καθὼς ἐλάλησαν περὶ αὐτῆς οἱ προφῆται*).

The *historical structure* with which the author is acquainted is therefore more unpretending than the former one, the temple of Solomon (οὐχ οἷος ὁ πρότερος). For surely he could hardly have expressed himself as he does if he was already acquainted with the temple of Herod. If this latter then forms the *terminus ad quem* for the composition of our book, the safest course would be to say that it was written *in the course of the last two centuries before Christ*. For we are precluded by the whole spirit of the book from going farther back.

In preparing his Latin version of our book Jerome made use of a *Chaldee text* precisely as in the case of the Book of Judith (see below). Such a text is *still extant* in the shape of a manuscript that only at a comparatively recent date found its way into the Bodleian library at Oxford, from which Neubauer took his edition (*The Book of Tobit, a Chaldee text*, etc., ed. by Neubauer, Oxford 1878). Both texts, the Latin of Jerome and the Chaldee one, are marked by a singular peculiarity common to themselves, and to themselves alone. The peculiarity in question is this, that while, according to the Greek text and the other versions, Tobit in the first section (i. 1–iii. 6) tells his story in the *first* person, and only changes to the *third* after Sarah makes her appearance in the narrative, Jerome and the author of the Chaldee text, on the other hand, make use of the third person from beginning to end. From this it is highly probable that Jerome had before him, if not exactly our Chaldee text, at all events one very much akin to it (that our Chaldee text is only the reproduction of an older one is probable for other reasons, see below). But the peculiarity just referred to also serves to prove at the same time that our Chaldee text is *not* based upon the Greek one. For the inserting of the third person all through is clearly an afterthought, while the transition from the first to the third correctly represents the original text. *But there is no ground whatever for supposing that our Greek text is a version based upon a Semitic original.* For the

two Hebrew texts, which were printed in the sixteenth century, are also later products (see below). On the other hand, there are numerous peculiarities of diction (for example the phrase *καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός*, vii. 7) which serve to confirm the view that the Greek must have been the original text.¹⁰

It would appear, from what Origen asserts, that in his time our book was not in use among the (Palestinian) Jews, and that a Hebrew text was unheard of (Origen, *Epist. ad African.* chap. xiii.; for the terms of the passage, see p. 85. Idem, *De oratione*, chap. xiv. = Lommatzsch, xvii. 143: *τῇ δὲ τοῦ Τωβίτ βιβλῷ ἀντιτίκουν οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς ὡς μὴ ἰδιωθέντες*). But that it came to be received with favour not long after is proved by the existing Semitic manuscripts, with one of which Jerome was already acquainted.

Its use in the Christian Church is already evidenced by the apostolic Fathers. Comp. 2 Clem. xvi. 4 = Tobit xii. 8 (on which see Harnack's notes to 2 Clem.). *Epist. Polycarp.* x. 2 = Tobit iv. 10. According to Irenaeus, i. 80. 11, the Ophites included Tobias among the Old Testament prophets. Clement of Alexandria repeatedly quotes the book as *γραφή* (*Strom.* ii. 23. 139, vi. 12. 102). Hippolytus in his commentary on the story of Susannah brings in the story of Tobit by way of parallel (Hippolyt. ed. Lagarde, p. 151). Origen in his *Epist. ad African.* refers at some length to the story of Tobias, and adds quite in a general way: *χρῶνται τῇ Τωβίτῃ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι*. Consequently he in like manner frequently quotes it as *γραφή* (*Comment. in epist. ad Rom.* book viii. chap. xi. *fin.* = Lommatzsch, vii. 272; *De oratione*, chap. xi. = Lommatzsch, xvii. 124; comp. besides, *De oratione*, chap. xiv. and xxxi. = Lommatzsch, xvii. 143, 284; *contra Cels.* v. 19 = Lommatzsch, xix. 196). Cyprian makes frequent use of the book (*Testimon.* iii. 1, 6, 62; *Ad Fortunatum*, chap. xi.; *De opere et eleemosynis*, chaps. v. and xx.). For more on this subject, see the works on the history of the Canon; also Jahn's *Einleit. in die göttl. Bücher des Alten Bundes*, 2nd ed. vol. ii. § 3 and 4 (1808), 1st and 2nd appendices.

Of the Greek text there are three recensions in existence: (1) The one found in the majority of manuscripts, and among others also in *Codex Vaticanus* (No. ii.) and *Alexandrinus* (No. iii.). To it the Syrian version adheres as far as chap. vii. 9. (2) The text of the *Codex Sinaiticus* (No. x.), which deviates very much from the ordinary text. To it again the old Latin version adheres, though not entirely yet chiefly. (3) The text of *Codices* 44, 106 and 107 (according to the numbering of Holmes and Parsons), which is akin to that of the *Codex Sinaiticus*. However, this latter appears to have been adhered to by the manuscripts just mentioned only from vi. 9 to xiii. 8, while in all that precedes and follows they conform to the ordinary recension. This text again is that on which,

¹⁰ Comp. also Fritzsch's *Commentar*, p. 8. Nöldeke, *Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1879, p. 61.

from vii. 10 onwards, the Syrian version is based. Whether the ordinary text or that of the *Codex Sinaiticus* is the original one it is difficult to determine, for the claims of both admit of being well supported. Fritzsche (*Proleg.* to his edition), and Nöldeke (*Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*), 1879, p. 45 sqq., decide in favour of the ordinary text, while Reusch (in his separate edition; comp. also *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1878, p. 333 sq.) upholds the claims of the *Codex Sinaiticus*. In Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha the whole three texts are printed alongside of each other. The text of the *Codex Sinaiticus* has been published separately by Reusch (*Libellus Tobit e codice Sinaitico editus et recensitus*, Bonnæ 1870). Comp. further on the editions, p. 10.

Of the early versions we may mention: (1) The *Latin*, and that (a) the old *Latin one*, the text of which shows very considerable variations in the four manuscripts collated by Sabatier, though it substantially agrees with that of the *Codex Sinaiticus* (Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. i.). Sabatier's four manuscripts represent two recensions, the one of which is contained in three of them, and the other in the remaining one (*Vat.* 7).¹¹ Fragments of a third recension are furnished by the quotations given in the *Speculum Augustini* (on which see Reusch, *Das Buch Tobias*, 1857, p. xxvi.), edited by Mai. The text of a certain *Codex Ambrosianus* has not yet been inspected. Ceriani contemplates preparing an edition of it for the *Monum. sacra et profana*, but so far as I am aware it has not as yet appeared. The same may be said of a Munich codex, which Ziegler purposes editing (Neubauer, *The Book of Tobit*, p. 10, note 6). See in general, Ilgen, *Die Geschichte Tobit's*, p. 183 sqq. Fritzsche, *Handb.* p. 11 sq. Reusch, *Das Buch Tobias*, p. 25 sqq. Sengelmann, *Das Buch Tobit*, pp. 49-56. (b) Jerome's version (= *Vulgata*), which was executed in circumstances similar to those under which that of Judith was prepared, see *Praef. in vers. libri Tob.* (Vallarsi, x. 1 sq.): Exigitis, ut librum Chaldaeo sermone conscriptum ad Latinum stilum traham, librum utique Tobiae, quem Hebraei de catalogo divinarum scripturarum secantes his quae apocrypha [al. hagiographa] memorant manciparunt. Feci satis desiderio vestro . . . Et quia vicina est Chaldaeorum lingua sermoni Hebraico, utriusque linguae peritissimum loquacem reperiens, unius diei laborem arripui, et quidquid ille mihi Hebraicis verbis expressit, hoc ego accito notario sermonibus Latinis exposui. A comparison of this version with the old Latin one will show that Jerome based his translation upon this latter, giving a somewhat free rendering of it, however much he may, at the same time, have kept the Chaldee text in view. Comp. Ilgen, p. cxliv. sqq. Fritzsche, p. xii. sq. Reusch, p. xxxii. Sengelmann, pp. 56-61. We have no further means of verification notwithstanding the recovery of the Chaldee text, for this latter is itself simply a reproduction, with greater or less accuracy, of the original one. (2) The *Syriac* text which has come down to

¹¹ The text of *Vaticanus* 7 has (according to Reusch, *Libellus Tobit*, 1870, p. 4) been more carefully edited by Bianchini, *Vindiciae canonicarum scripturarum*, Romae 1740, p. cocl., than by Sabatier. On this text comp. also Bickell, *Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol.* 1878, p. 218.

ns (printed for the first time in the *London Polyglot*, vol. iv.) is composed of the fragments of two different versions, one of which (as far as vii. 9) followed the ordinary Greek text, while the other (from vii. 10 onwards) followed the text of Codices 44, 106, 107. See Ilgen, pp. cxxxvii. sq., clxix. sqq. Reusch, p. xx. sq. Sengelmann, p. 47 sq. On the editions, see p. 11. The Book of Tobit is not given in the large Peschito manuscript of Milan.

(3) The *Chaldee* text (see p. 40 above), edited by Neubauer, agrees substantially with the Greek recension of the *Codex Sinaiticus* on which it was probably based. But the text as we now have it is in all likelihood only an abridged and modified form of an older Chaldee text. See, besides Neubauer's edition, Bickell, *Zeitschr. für kathol. Theol.* 1878, pp. 216-222, and especially Nöldeke, *Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1879, pp. 45-69.

(4) Lastly, we have further to mention two *Hebrew versions* which have been frequently printed since the sixteenth century, namely: (a) The so-called *Hebraeus Fagii*, a Hebrew version based upon the ordinary Greek text published first of all at Constantinople in 1517, and then by Fagius in 1542. On this see Ilgen, p. cxxxviii. sqq. Fritzsche, p. 9 sq. Reusch, p. xlvii. Sengelmann, p. 68 sq. (b) The *Codex Hebraeus Münsteri*, a free Hebrew version which (according to Neubauer, p. 12) was published first at Constantinople in 1516, and then by Sebastian Münster in 1542. Until the discovery of the Chaldee text it was supposed that the old Latin version was based upon it (so Ilgen, p. ccxvii. sqq.; Fritzsche, p. 14; Reusch, p. xlvii. sq.; Sengelmann, p. 61 sqq.). After seeing the Chaldee text, we cannot but regard it as certain that the *Codex Hebraeus Münsteri* is based upon it, though not on that text as it has come down to us, but on an older form of it. See especially Nöldeke as above; also Bickell as above. As in the Greek text, so also in this older form, the first person was made use of in the first three chapters, and this has also been retained in the *Codex Heb. Münsteri*. Neubauer has published an excellent edition of this codex based upon a collation of two manuscripts, and accompanied with an English translation (*The Book of Tobit, a Chaldee text*, etc., ed. by Neubauer, Oxford 1878). Both the Hebrew texts along with a Latin translation have also found a place in the *London Polyglot*, vol. iv. On the earlier editions, comp. Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, i. 391 sqq., ii. 413 sq., iii. 275, iv. 154. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* iii. 738 sq. Steinschneider, *Catalogus librorum Hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana* (1852-1860), cols. 200-202. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 425.

For the *ezegetical aids* generally, see p. 11, above. Commentaries: Ilgen, *Die Geschichte Tobit's nach drei verschieden Originalen, dem Griechischen dem Lateinischen des Hieronymus und einem Syrischen übersetzt und mit Anmerkungen ezegetischen und kritischen Inhalts auch einer Einleitung versehen*, Jena 1800. Fritzsche, *Die Bücher Tobit und Judith erklärt (Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokryphen*, vol. ii.), Leipzig 1853. Reusch, *Das Buch Tobias übersetzt und erklärt*, Freiburg 1857. Sengelmann, *Das Buch Tobit erklärt*, Münster 1877. For the older literature, consult Fabricius-Harles, iii. 738 sq. Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii. 425 sq. Fritzsche, p. 20. Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 496.

Special disquisitions: [Eichhorn], "Ueber das Buch Tobias" (*Allgem. Biblioth. der bibl. Literatur*, ii. 410 sqq.). Reusch, "Der Dämon Asmodäus im B. Tobias" (*Theol. Quartalschr.* 1856, pp. 422-445). Idem, Review of Sengelmann, in the *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1858, pp. 318-332. *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*, iv. 1857, pp. 59-71, vi. 1858, pp. 378-382. Hitzig, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1860, pp. 250-261. Hilgenfeld, *ibid.* 1862, pp. 181-198. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iv. (3rd ed.) p. 269 sqq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iv. (2nd ed.) p. 466 sq. note 17. Kohut, "Etwas über die Moral und die Abfassungszeit d. B. Tobias" (*Geiger's Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissenschaft u. Leben*, x. 1872, pp. 49-73; also in a separate form). Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellez.* v. 540 sqq. Renan, *L'église chrétienne* (1879), pp. 554-561. Grätz, *Monatschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1879, pp. 145 sqq., 385 sqq., 433 sqq., 509 sqq. Grimm, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1881, pp. 33-56. Preiss, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1885, pp. 24-51. The introductions of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, Nöldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see p. 12).

V. PSEUDEPIGRAPHIC PROPHECIES.

The whole of the literary products hitherto mentioned were fashioned more or less after the models of the older and by that time the canonical literature, to which moreover they made the closest approximation both in point of spirit and matter. We have now a new species of literature, and one that, in our period, was more popular and influential than any other, namely, the *pseudepigraphic prophecies*. The old prophets, in their teachings and exhortations, addressed themselves directly to the people, and that first and foremost through their oral utterances and then, but only as subordinate to these, by means of written discourse as well. But now when men felt themselves impelled at any time by their religious enthusiasm to try to influence their contemporaries through their teaching and exhortations, instead of directly addressing them in person like the prophets of old, they did so by a writing purporting to be the work of some one or other of the great names of the past, in the hope that in this way the effect would be all the surer and all the more powerful. We may venture to regard the predilection shown for the kind of medium here in question as evidence of the

somewhat degenerate character of the age. It shows that there were natures of a highly religious cast who nevertheless had no longer the courage to confront their contemporaries with the proud claim to have their words listened to as the words of God Himself, but who rather seemed to think it necessary to conceal themselves under the guise of some one or other of the acknowledged authorities of the olden time. And so for this reason all the writings of a prophetic character that make their appearance in our period are *pseudepigraphic*. They are given to the world bearing the name of an *Enoch*, a *Moses*, a *Baruch*, an *Ezra*, or of the *twelve patriarchs*, but we do not know who the real author is of any one of them. Then the standpoint of the pseudonymous author to whom the work is ascribed is, as a rule, skilfully maintained throughout. The writings are composed in such a way as to make it appear as though they had actually been intended for the contemporaries of the respective personages whose names they bear. But what is addressed to those assumed contemporaries is in reality of such a nature that it concerns rather more the contemporaries of the real author himself. From his artificially assumed standpoint the writer looks on into the future and predicts, often with considerable detail, the future history of Israel and the world, but always taking care to see that predictions stop short at his (the real author's) own time, and so to arrange matters as to make it appear that this was also to be the time of judgment and of the dawn of redemption alike, and all this for the purpose of serving as a warning to sinners on the one hand and to comfort and encourage the godly on the other. The fact that the alleged predictions are seen to have been already fulfilled in the previous history of Israel and the world, serves at the same time to inspire confidence in the prophet so that there will now be a readier disposition to believe him when he predicts what (from the standpoint of the real contemporaries) still lies in the future.

The *contents* of those pseudepigraphic prophecies are of a very varied description. As in the older prophetic writings,

so also in these two things were as a rule combined with each other, viz. *instruction* and *exhortation*. Prominence is given sometimes to the one and sometimes to the other, to the former for example in the Book of Enoch, to the latter in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. But in no case is one or other of them found to be entirely absent. The exhortation is uniformly based upon the previous instruction, while the religious instruction thus imparted always aims at stimulating the reader to a behaviour of a corresponding nature. But the character of the writings varied very much according as one or other of those elements happened to predominate in them. At one time they give one more the impression of moral sermons (as for example the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs), at another they are more concerned with the unveiling of divine mysteries (as in the case of the Book of Enoch). Yet however much they may thus differ from one another, they all belong, so far as their essential character is concerned, to one and the same category. The revelations given in them, in due keeping with their hortatory purpose, have reference first of all to the history of the Jewish people and of mankind in general, but they also concern themselves, though only in a more subordinate way, with certain theological problems, such as the question regarding the connection between sin and calamity on the one hand and righteousness and prosperity on the other. But besides this they also seek to enlighten the reader with regard to the mysteries of nature, the supernatural and heavenly background of the operations of the natural world. On all those matters, which are more or less remotely connected with the religious life, they claim to give authentic information.

The *form* in which those communications are clothed is that of *apocalypse*. They claim throughout to be supernatural revelations given to mankind by the mouth of those men of God in whose names the various writings appear. The peculiarity of this later "apocalyptic" medium as distinguished from the older genuine prophecy is this, that it imparts its

revelations not in clear and plain language, but in a mysterious *enigmatical form*. The thing intended to be communicated is veiled under parables and symbols, the meaning of which can only be guessed at. However, the extent to which this veiling is carried is not always the same. At one time it only goes the length of the author's abstaining from mentioning the *names* of persons that are otherwise plainly enough indicated, while at another again the whole thing is symbolical from beginning to end. Persons are represented under the symbolism of animals, events in the history of the human race under that of the operations of nature. And if, as sometimes happens, the interpretation is added, this latter again is only a less obscure form of the enigma and not a solution of it.

The majority of those writings were *occasioned* by times of trouble and distress, or by the depressed circumstances of the people generally. It is the contradiction that is found to exist between the ideal and the actual, between the promises which God has given to His people and the existing bondage and persecution which they had to endure at the hands of Gentile powers,—it was this contradiction I say that impelled their authors to write those works. And where no present trouble or persecution actually existed, the motive for writing may be looked for in the pessimistic view of things which they were cherishing at the time. The existing state of matters, the present condition of the chosen people, was felt to be a glaring contradiction to its true destiny. Such a state of things could not last, an entire revolution must of necessity take place and that ere long. Such is the conviction to which expression is given in the whole of the writings now in question. They therefore owe their origin, on the one hand, to a pessimistic view of the present and, on the other, to an intense faith in the glorious future of the people. And the *object* at which their authors aim is to awaken and quicken the same faith in others as well. They insist that there must be no such thing as doubting, but rather a clinging

with all steadfastness to the belief that God will conduct His people safely through all the afflictions which He has been sending upon them in order to test and purify them, and bring them at length to greatness and glory. This belief must meanwhile comfort and encourage the people in the midst of their present sufferings. But inasmuch as the revolution in question is represented as being near at hand, the wicked are meant at the same time to take warning from this and repent so long as there is an opportunity to do so. For the coming judgment will be a right stern one, bringing salvation to the godly and perdition to the wicked. The actual *effect* of those enthusiastic predictions appears to have been both powerful and lasting. Through them the Messianic hope was quickened, through them the people were confirmed in the belief that they were called not to serve but to rule. But it is for this very reason that this apocalyptic literature has played so important a part in developing the political sentiments of the people. If we find that, from the date of the tax imposed by Quirinius, whereby Judaea was placed directly under Roman administration, revolutionary tendencies among the people grew stronger and stronger year by year till they led at last to the great insurrection of the year 66, then there cannot be a doubt that this process was essentially promoted if not exclusively caused by the apocalyptic literature.

The standpoint of the whole of those writings is essentially that of orthodox Judaism. They exhort to a God-fearing behaviour in accordance with the regulative principles of the law, and deplore the tendency to disregard the law that was manifesting itself here and there. But, at the same time, it is not the official Judaism of the Pharisaic scribes to which expression is given here. The principal stress is laid not on what the people have *to do*, but on what they have *to expect*. In regard to the former of these, viz. conduct, matters are treated more in their general aspect, without any special stress being laid exactly upon scholastic correctness in details. We should further add that neither are these writings without

numerous individual peculiarities, as is only to be expected in the case of the products, such as these are, of an intense religious enthusiasm. However, we cannot feel warranted in specifying the particular circle from which any one of those writings may be supposed to have emanated. The *Essenes* above all have been thought of in this connection.¹³ But what points of contact there are, are far too slender to admit of our speaking even of one of the writings in question as an *Essenian* product. The most we can say is, that they are not the product of the school, but of a free religious individuality.

1. *The Book of Daniel.*

The oldest and most original of the kind of writings now under consideration—and the one that at the same time served as a model for those of a later date—is the canonical Book of Daniel. The unknown author of this apocalypse originated with creative energy those modes of representation of which the subsequent authors of similar works knew how to avail themselves. The book is the *direct product of the Maccabæan struggles*, in the very heart of which it came into existence. With the conflict actually raging around him, the author aims at encouraging and comforting his co-religionists by assuring them of speedy deliverance.

The book is divided into two parts. *The first part* (i.–vi.) *contains a series of hortatory narratives*; the *second* (vii.–xii.) *a series of prophetic visions*. Chap. i. rehearses how young Daniel and his three companions were brought up at the court of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon. We are told how, in order to avoid defiling themselves by partaking of Gentile food, the four young men refused to eat of the meat provided for them by the king, and preferred pulse and water instead.

¹³ So Hilgenfeld in his book entitled *Die jüdische Apokalypik* (1857), p. 258 sqq.; and, to a certain extent, also Lucius, *Der Essenismus* (1881), p. 109 sqq.

Notwithstanding this, as we further learn, they seemed to thrive better than the other young men who partook of the royal fare. The hortatory object of this narrative is obvious at a glance. In chap. ii. Nebuchadnezzar the king dreams a dream, and calls upon the magi not only to interpret it, but also to tell him what the dream itself was. Not one however of the magi of the country is found able to do this. Daniel alone shows himself capable of performing such a feat, and for this he is abundantly rewarded by the king, and appointed to the office of chief of all the magi of Babylon. In the course of the interpretation of the dream it is intimated that the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar would be succeeded by yet three other kingdoms, the last of which (the Greek one) would be "split up" (into that of the Ptolemies on the one hand, and that of the Seleucidae on the other) and crushed to pieces by the hand of God. In chap. iii. Nebuchadnezzar causes a golden image to be set up and orders it to be worshipped. For refusing to comply with this order Daniel's three companions are cast into a fiery furnace, but when it is found that they were not in the least injured by the flames, Nebuchadnezzar sees his own folly and promotes the three young men to positions of high distinction. In chap. iv. Nebuchadnezzar publishes an edict in which he confesses how, as a punishment for his impious presumption, he was smitten with insanity; and how, after he had duly given God the glory, he is restored once more to his former greatness. In chap. v. Belshazzar king of Babylon and son of Nebuchadnezzar makes a great feast, at which the vessels which his father had taken from the temple at Jerusalem are made use of as drinking-cups. To punish Belshazzar for this he loses both his kingdom and his life together that very night. In chap. vi. Darius king of the Medes, and the conqueror and successor of Belshazzar, in order to punish Daniel for praying to his own God in defiance of the king's prohibition, causes him to be cast into a den of lions, where however he does not sustain the slightest injury. The result of this is that

Darius comes to see his own folly, and issues a decree to the effect that Daniel's God is to be worshipped throughout the whole kingdom. It is no less obvious that a hortatory purpose pervades the last four of those narratives (iii.-vi.) as well, while, at the same time, the contemporary historical background is also plainly discernible. By the three kings we are in every instance to understand Antiochus Epiphanes as being the person meant, who, with impious arrogance, assumed such lofty airs (iv.), who carried off the sacred vessels from the temple at Jerusalem (v.), who forbade the Jews to worship their own God (vi.), and commanded them to pay divine honour to the gods of the Gentiles (iii.). We are shown how, as a judgment for his misdeeds, he is given over to destruction, and how, on the other hand, the Jews whom he persecuted are miraculously delivered. While therefore all those narratives are meant to stimulate to unflinching steadfastness the faithful people whom Antiochus was persecuting, we are introduced in the *second part* of the book (vii.-xii.) to a series of visions in which, from the standpoint of the Chaldaean period, the future development of the events of the world is foretold. The whole of the visions agree in this, that the monarchy which they foretell as being the last is the Greek one, which ultimately resolves itself into the godless rule of Antiochus Epiphanes, who, though not mentioned by name, is plainly enough indicated. We have above all in the last vision (from x. to xii.) a prediction of a highly detailed character, in which are foretold the history of the kingdoms of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae respectively (for it is these that are meant by the kingdom of the south and the kingdom of the north), and their manifold relations to one another. Here the most remarkable thing is that the prediction becomes more and more minute and detailed the nearer it approaches to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Precisely the history of this monarch is here related with the utmost minuteness, without his name being once mentioned (xi. 21 sqq.). It is still the suppression of the Jewish worship,

the desecration of the temple, and the erection of the heathen altar for sacrifice, as well as the commencement of the Maccabæan insurrection (xi. 32–35), that are predicted. But at this point the predictions suddenly stop, and the author now cherishes the expectation that, immediately after the struggles connected with the rising in question, the consummation will come and the kingdom of God begin to appear. Nor is it merely in the eleventh chapter that the predictions stop at this period, but in no other part of the book does the horizon of the author ever stretch beyond it, not even in the visions of the four monarchies (ii. and vii.). For the fourth is not the Roman Empire, but the Greek monarchy, as any one who candidly considers the matter will readily admit (the first being the Babylonian, the second that of the Medes, the third the Persian, and the fourth the Greek). In presence of these facts it is admitted by all the expositors of the present day—by all, that is, who are not hampered by dogmatic predilections—that our book was composed at the time of the Maccabæan rising, or, to speak more precisely, between 167 and 165 B.C., that is to say before the re-consecrating of the temple, for as yet this latter event lies beyond the horizon of the author. It is only as viewed in the light of this period that the book can be said to have either sense or meaning. From beginning to end it is framed with the view of exercising a practical influence precisely in such a time as this. With its various narratives and revelations it seeks, on the one hand, to encourage the hosts of faithful Israelites to maintain a steadfast adherence to the law, and, on the other, to console them with the certain prospect of immediate deliverance. It is even at this very moment—such is the author's thought—when the distress is at its height, that the deliverance is also nearest at hand. The days of the Gentile monarchies are drawing to a close. The last and, at the same time, the most godless and criminal of them all, is on the point of being annihilated through the impending miraculous breaking in on the part of God upon the current of the

world's history, whereupon the sovereignty of the world will be committed to the "saints of the Most High," the faithful Israelites. They will inherit the kingdom and possess it for ever and ever. That is what those who are just now so sorely oppressed and persecuted are to bear in mind for their comfort and encouragement.

The book was composed partly in Hebrew and partly in Aramaic (Chaldee), the Aramaic portion being that extending from ii. 4 to vii. 28. And so from this we can see that it was just then that the Aramaic came to be the prevailing dialect of Palestine, while the Hebrew fell more and more into desuetude. In the course of two centuries after this, viz. in the time of Jesus Christ, we find that the process, which at this point is thus beginning, has been already fully completed (see Div. ii. vol. i. p. 9).

The high estimation in which from the first this book was held by believing Israelites is best shown by the fact that it always continued to retain its place in the canon. Even that somewhat older work, the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach, was ultimately excluded from the Hebrew canon, and that, although in point of form and contents it approximates more closely to the early Hebrew literature than the Book of Daniel. Obviously the reason of both those facts is this, that the work of Jesus the son of Sirach was published under the author's real name, whereas the Book of Daniel appeared under the name of one of the older authorities. It is in fact the only literary product of its time that retained a place in the canon, with the exception of a number of psalms which happened to have been previously embodied in the Psalter. We already find evidence of acquaintance with our book in the oldest of the Sibyls (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 396-400, only a few decades later than Daniel); further in 1 Macc. ii. 59, 60, and Baruch i. 15-18.

The exegetical and critical literature of the Book of Daniel is enumerated in De Wette-Schrader's *Einleitung in die kanon. und apokr. Bücher des A. T.* (1869), p. 485 sq. Kleinert, *Abriß der Einleitung zum A. T.* (1878), pp. 59-61. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 464. Graf, art. "Daniel," in Schenkel's *Bibellez.* i. 564.

Perhaps we may be allowed in passing to offer here a small contribution toward the exposition of chap. ix. 24-27. In that passage the author endeavours to explain the seventy years of Jeremiah (Jer. xxv. 11, 12), by taking them to mean seventy weeks of years (70×7). And this number again he proceeds to break up into $7 + 62 + 1$. Then, as the context makes it well-nigh impossible to doubt, he reckons the first seven weeks of years (therefore 49 years) as the period that would elapse between the destruc-

tion of Jerusalem and the accession of Cyrus, which pretty nearly coincides with the actual number of years embraced in that period (588-537 B.C.). The subsequent sixty-two weeks of years he reckons, and that with rather more nicety than before, as being the period extending from the time of Cyrus to his (the author's) own day: till "an anointed one shall be cut off," by which we have probably to understand the murder of the high priest Onias III. in the year 171. But the number of years between 537 and 171 is only 366, whereas 62 weeks of years would be equal to 434. Consequently the author has miscalculated to the extent of 70 years. Some have supposed that this is impossible, and have therefore tried in various ways to evade the only interpretation of which the context will permit. But that such an error as this is actually possible is proved most conclusively by the circumstance that Josephus, for example, likewise falls into an error of a similar kind, as may be seen from the three following passages: (1) *Bell. Jud.* vi. 4. 8, where he gives 639 as the number of years that elapsed between the second year of Cyrus's reign till the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (70 A.D.). In that case the second year of Cyrus's reign would have to be the year 569 B.C. (2) *Antt.* xx. 10, where he makes out that there was a period of 414 years between the return from the captivity (in the first year of Cyrus's reign) and the time of Antiochus V. Eupator (164-162). (3) *Antt.* xiii. 11. 1, where he calculates that 481 years elapsed between the return from the captivity (in the first year of the reign of Cyrus) and the time of Aristobulus (105-104). Consequently according to (1) the accession of Cyrus must have taken place in the year 570 B.C., according to (2) somewhere about 578 B.C., and according to (3) in 586 B.C., whereas in point of fact it took place in 537 B.C. *Josephus therefore has miscalculated to the extent of from forty to fifty years too many.* A somewhat nearer approach to the numbers of Daniel is made by the Jewish Hellenist Demetrius, who reckons that 573 years elapsed between the carrying away of the ten tribes into captivity and the time of Ptolemy IV. (222 B.C.), and so, *precisely like Daniel, putting it at some seventy years too many* (see the passage as given in Clement of Alexand. *Strom.* i. 21. 141; for more about Demetrius, see § 33 below). Therefore, in estimating the length of the period in question at some seventy years too much, Daniel is obviously following some current view on the matter. Just at the time now under consideration there was as yet an absence of the necessary means for determining the correct chronology. In Daniel's case, however, the error is all the less to be wondered at, that his estimating the length of the period referred to at sixty-two year weeks was simply a consequence of his interpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy.

2. The Book of Enoch.

Enoch (in common with *Elijah*) occupies this singular position among the Old Testament men of God, that when removed from the earth he was carried directly to heaven.

A man of this stamp could not but appear peculiarly well fitted to serve as a medium through which to communicate to the world revelations regarding the divine mysteries, seeing that he had even been deemed worthy of immediate intercourse with God. Accordingly at a somewhat early period, probably as far back as the second century before Christ, an apocalyptic writing appeared purporting to have been composed by Enoch, which work was subsequently issued in an enlarged and revised form. This Book of Enoch was already known to the author of the Book of "Jubilees" and of the "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," and was afterwards a great favourite in the Christian Church. As is well known, it is quoted in the Epistle of Jude (14, 15), while many of the Fathers use it without hesitation as the genuine production of Enoch, and as containing authentic divine revelations, although it has never been officially recognised by the Church as canonical. We still find the Byzantine chronicler, George Syncellus (about 800 A.D.), quoting two long passages from it (Syncell. *Chron.* ed. Dindorf, i. 20-23 and 42-47). But after that the book disappeared, and was looked upon as lost till, in the course of last century, the discovery was made that an *Ethiopic version of it was still extant* in the Abyssinian Church. In the year 1773, Bruce the English traveller brought three manuscripts of it to Europe. But it was not till the year 1821 that the whole work was given to the world through the English translation of Laurence. A German translation was issued by Hoffmann which, from chap. i. to lv. (1833), was based upon the English version of Laurence, and from chap. lvi. to the end (1838) on the Ethiopic version collated with a new manuscript. The Ethiopic text was published first by Laurence in 1838, and subsequently by Dillmann in 1851, after having collated it with five manuscripts. Dillmann likewise issued (1853) a new German translation, in which there were material emendations, and on which all disquisitions connected with this book have been based ever since. It seemed as though there were reason to hope that

more light would be thrown upon this book when a small fragment of it in Greek (extending from ver. 42 to ver. 49 of chap. lxxxix.), taken from a *Codex Vaticanus* (cod. gr. 1809), written in tachygraphic characters, was published in facsimile by Mai (*Patrum Nova Biblioth.*, vol. ii.), and deciphered by Gildmeister (*Zeitschr. der DMG.* 1855, pp. 621-624). For, from what was stated by Mai, one was led to suppose that there was still far more in the codex than had yet been published. But, alas! a fresh examination by Gebhardt revealed the fact that the deciphered fragment was all of the Book of Enoch that it contained (Merx' *Archiv*, vol. ii. p. 243).

But in order to be able to form something like a clear idea of the origin and character of this remarkable book, it will be necessary to present to the reader a brief outline of its contents.

Chap. i. 1: Title. Enoch's benediction on the elect and the righteous. Chaps. i.-v.: Introduction. Enoch rehearses the fact that he saw a vision in heaven, which was shown him by the angels who communicated to him the history of all the future generations of men, telling him that the wicked would be sentenced to everlasting damnation, while the righteous would obtain eternal life. Chaps. vi.-xi. contain an account of the fall of the angels, based upon the sixth chapter of Genesis, though in a much more elaborate form. God ordains the kind of punishment to which the fallen angels are to be condemned, and appoints the mode in which the earth is to be purged of their evil-doing and wickedness. The angels are entrusted with the task of executing both those behests. In chaps. xii.-xvi. Enoch, who mingles among the angels in heaven, is commissioned by these latter to betake himself to the earth for the purpose of announcing to the fallen angels the impending judgment (here Enoch resumes the use of the first person). When he has fulfilled his commission the fallen angels prevail upon him to intercede with God in their behalf. But God refuses to entertain the intercession of Enoch, who in a new and imposing vision receives a fresh

commission to go and announce once more their approaching destruction. In xvii.-xxxvi. Enoch relates (in the first person) how he was carried over mountains, water and rivers, and shown everywhere the secret divine origin of all the objects and operations of nature. He also tells how he was shown the ends of the earth, and the place to which the evil angels were banished; and the abode of departed spirits, of the just as well as the unjust; and the tree of life which is in store for the elect righteous; and the place of punishment for the condemned; and the tree of knowledge of which Adam and Eve had eaten. Chaps. xxxvii. to lxxi. record "the second vision of wisdom which Enoch the son of Jared saw," consisting of *three allegories*. Chaps. xxxviii. to xlv. contain the first allegory. Enoch sees in a vision the dwellings of the righteous and the resting-places of the saints. He also sees the myriads upon myriads who stand before the majesty of the Lord of spirits, and the four archangels Michael, Raphael, Gabriel, and Phanuel. He is further permitted to look upon the mysteries of heaven, to see the places where the winds are kept, and the receptacles for the sun and moon, and lastly to behold the lightning and the stars of heaven, all of which have their own special names, and which names they respectively answer to. Chaps. xlv. to lvii. contain the second allegory. Enoch is favoured with information regarding the "Chosen One," the "Son of man," i.e. regarding the Messiah, His nature and mission, how He is to judge the world and establish His kingdom. Chaps. lviii. to lxix. contain the third allegory, treating of the blessedness of the righteous and the elect; of the mysteries of the thunder and lightning; of the day on which the Chosen One, the Son of man, is to sit in judgment upon the world. Here several portions are inserted which interrupt the continuity and plainly show that they are interpolations by another hand. Chaps. lxx.-lxxi. contain the conclusion of the allegories. In chaps. lxxii.-lxxxii. we have "the book concerning the revolutions of the lights of heaven," or *the astronomical book*. Here Enoch favours us with all

sorts of astronomical information which he himself had obtained from the angel Uriel. Chaps. lxxxiii. to xc. contain *two visions*. (a) In lxxxiii. to lxxxiv. Enoch sees in a dreadful vision the destruction (by the flood) which is awaiting the sinful world, and prays God not to annihilate the whole human family. (b) In lxxxv. to xc. we have the vision of the cattle, sheep, wild beasts and shepherds; under the symbolism of which the whole history of Israel is predicted down to the commencement of the Messianic era. As this historical vision is the only part of the book which enables us with anything like approximate certainty to determine the date of its composition, we will devote more special attention to its contents at a subsequent stage. In chap. xci. we have Enoch's exhortation to his children to lead a righteous life (by way of conclusion to what goes before). Chap. xcii. forms the introduction to the next section. In xciii. and xciv. 12-17, Enoch enlightens us "out of the books" regarding the *world-weeks*. In the first week Enoch lives, in the second Noah, in the third Abraham, in the fourth Moses, in the fifth the temple is built, at the end of the sixth it is destroyed again, in the seventh an apostate generation arises, and at the end of those weeks the righteous are instructed in the mysteries of heaven; in the eighth righteousness receives a sword, and sinners are given into the hands of the righteous, and a house is built for the great King; in the ninth the judgment is revealed; in the tenth and in the seventh part of it the final judgment will take place. Chaps. xciv. to cv. contain woes upon the wicked and the ungodly, the announcement of their certain destruction, and an exhortation to cherish joyful expectations addressed to the righteous (very diffuse and full of mere repetitions). In chaps. cvi. and cvii. we have a narrative of the birth of Noah and what took place at it. The wonderful appearance of this personage gives Enoch occasion to predict the flood. Chap. cviii. contains "a further writing by Enoch," in which he tells hows he had got certain information from an angel regarding the fire of hell to which the souls of the

wicked and the blaspheming are to be consigned, as well as regarding the blessings that are in store for the humble and the righteous.

As may be seen from this outline of its contents, this book purports to be a series of revelations with which Enoch was favoured in the course of his peregrinations through heaven and earth, and of his sojourn among the heavenly spirits. These revelations he committed to writing for the benefit of mankind and transmitted them to posterity. The contents are of an extremely varied character. They embrace the laws of nature no less than the organization and history of the kingdom of God. To impart information regarding the whole of those matters is the purpose and object of this mysterious book. The work furnishes but few data that can be turned to account in the way of enabling us to make out the circumstances under which it was composed. Consequently the views that have been expressed relative to this are of a widely divergent order. Still a certain consensus of opinion has grown up with regard to at least a few leading points. In the first place we may say that the view of J. Chr. K. von Hofmann, Weisse, and Philippi, to the effect that the *entire* book is the work of a *Christian* author (Hofmann holding that the interpolations are but of a trifling character) is confined pretty much to those writers themselves.¹⁸ In the case of the whole three of them the entertaining of such a view is essentially due to dogmatic reasons, while, in the case of Hofmann and Philippi in particular, it is to be attributed to a desire to get rid of the fact that our book is quoted in the Epistle of Jude (for they would have us believe that conversely it was that passage in the Book of Jude that first suggested the writing of the book now under consideration). But speaking generally, it may be affirmed that there is scarcely any modern scholar who holds that the whole work was composed by one and the same author. Even Dillmann,

¹⁸ Lücke, who at one time (1st ed.) was also disposed to favour this view, decidedly abandoned it afterwards.

who in his translation and exposition still continued to assume a substantial unity of authorship (the interpolations being only trifling, although tolerably numerous), has—in spite of Wittichen's almost entire concurrence in it—long ago abandoned this view. He is now at one with almost all the critics in holding that the book consists of several pieces, and all of them entirely different from one another. On this assumption it is almost universally admitted that the *so-called* "*allegories*," chaps. xxxvii.–lxxi., *are above all to be ascribed to a separate author* (so for example Krieger, Lücke, 2nd ed., Ewald, Dillmann latterly, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Langen, Sieffert, Reuss, Volkmar). Likewise in the case of the other leading sections of the book (i.–xxxvi. and lxxii.–cviii.), interpolations more or less numerous are almost universally acknowledged to exist, although there is considerable diversity of opinion as to where in each instance they begin and end. Again, there is, comparatively speaking, a high degree of unanimity with regard to the date of the composition of each of those leading sections, above all, of the one containing the visions (lxxxiii.–xc.). Volkmar alone has found his predilection for the time of Barcocheba too much for him in this instance as well, preferring, as he does, to regard the portions in question as having been written by one of Akiba's disciples. All the others are agreed in holding that they belong to the second century B.C., either limiting the date to the earlier years of the Maccabæan period (so Krieger, Lücke, 2nd ed., Langen), or finding it further on, viz. in the days of John Hyrcanus (so Ewald, Dillmann, Köstlin, Sieffert, Reuss, likewise Wittichen), or even so late as the time of Alexander Jannæus (so Hilgenfeld). But it is with respect to that section which, as regards its contents, is the most important of any, viz. the allegories, chaps. xxxvi.–lxxi., that opinion fluctuates most of all. Here Hilgenfeld and Volkmar agree with Hofmann, Weisse, and Philippi thus far, that in common with these latter they ascribe the section in question to a Christian author (Hilgenfeld to a Gnostic writer). All other critics refer it to some

pre-Christian period, Langen to the earlier days of the Maccabæan age in common with the rest of the book, Ewald to somewhere about 144 B.C., Köstlin, Sieffert, and Dillmann (Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 351 sq.) to some date previous to 64 B.C., Krieger and Lücke to the early part of Herod's reign, while Reuss refrains from suggesting any date at all.

Such unanimity as has thus far been secured may serve at the same time to give us an idea how far we can here hope to obtain results of a trustworthy character. If there is one thing more certain than another it is this, that the *book is not all the production of one and the same author*. Not only is the section containing the allegories, chaps. xxxvii.-lxxi, undoubtedly a perfectly independent portion of the book, but all the rest of the work is composed of very heterogeneous elements, and obviously interspersed with a great number of longer or shorter interpolations. Confining ourselves to the leading portions of the work, the following groups may be distinguished :—

1. The *original writing*, i.e. the leading portion consisting of i.-xxxvi, lxxii.-cv., but with the restriction just referred to. The only clue we get to the date of its composition is that furnished by the *historical vision* in chaps. lxxxv.-xc. Here we have a representation of the entire history of the theocracy from Adam down to the author's own day, and that under the symbolism of cattle and sheep. In a vision presented to him in a dream, Enoch saw how a white ox (Adam) once sprung out of the earth; and then a white cow (Eve); and along with this latter yet other cattle, a black ox (Cain) and a red one (Abel). The black ox gored the red one, which thereupon vanished from the earth. But the black ox begat many other black cattle. Thereupon the cow just referred to (Eve) gave birth to a white ox (Seth), from which sprung a great many other white cattle. But stars (angels) fell from heaven, and after having had intercourse with the cows of the black cattle (the daughters of Cain), they begat elephants, camels, and asses (the giants). And so in this way the history is

proceeded with, the theocratic line being always represented by the white cattle. From Jacob onwards white sheep are substituted for the white cattle. The symbolic character of the representation is patent all through, while it presents hardly any difficulty in the way of interpretation till we come to the point where the sheep are attacked by wild animals, *i.e.* till the hostile powers of Assyria and Babylon come upon the stage. For in lxxxix. 55 it is narrated how the Lord of the sheep delivered them into the hand of the lions and tigers and wolves and jackals, and into the hand of the foxes, and all manner of wild beasts; and how the wild beasts began to tear the sheep to pieces. And the Lord forsook their house (Jerusalem) and their tower (the temple), lxxxix. 56, *i.e.* He withdrew His gracious presence from them (for there is no question of the destruction of these till a much later stage). And He appointed *seventy shepherds* to feed the sheep, and charged them to allow as many to be torn to pieces by the wild beasts as He would order them, but not more (lxxxix. 59, 60). And he summoned "another" and commanded him to write down the number of sheep destroyed by the shepherds (lxxxix. 61-64). And the shepherds fed them "each his time," and delivered the sheep into the hand of the lions and tigers. And these latter burnt down that tower (the temple) and destroyed that house (Jerusalem, lxxxix. 65, 66). And the shepherds delivered to the wild beasts far more sheep than they had been ordered to do (lxxxix. 68-71). And when the shepherds had fed the flock *twelve* hours, three of those sheep came back and began to rebuild the house (Jerusalem) and the tower (the temple), chap. lxxxix. 72, 73. But the sheep were so blinded as to mingle with the beasts of the field; and the shepherds did not rescue them from the hand of the beasts (lxxxix. 74, 75). But when *five-and-thirty*¹⁴ shepherds had fed them, all the

¹⁴ Dillmann reads thirty-six, which is not supported by manuscript authority. The manuscripts read thirty-seven. But, from what follows, there can hardly be a doubt that thirty-five is the correct reading.

fowls of the air, the eagles, the hawks, the kites and the ravens came and began to prey upon those sheep and to peck out their eyes and to devour their flesh (xc. 1, 2). And again when *three-and-twenty* shepherds had tended the flock and *eight-and-fifty* times in all were completed (xc. 5), then little lambs were born of the white sheep, and they began to cry to the sheep; but these pay no heed to them (xc. 6, 7). And the ravens swooped down upon the lambs and seized one of them, and tore and devoured the sheep, till horns grew upon the lambs, and, above all, a large horn shot out to which all the young ones betake themselves (xc. 8-10). And the eagles and the hawks and the kites still continue to tear the sheep to pieces. And the ravens sought to break to pieces the horn of that young sheep and struggled with it; and it strove with them. And the Lord came to the help of that young one; and all the beasts flee and fall before him (xc. 11-15). Here the narrative breaks off. For what follows seems for the author to lie in the future. It is only further remarked that *the twelve last shepherds* had destroyed more than those who had preceded them (xc. 17).

In their endeavours to interpret this narrative, so clear and perspicuous in all the leading points, the expositors seem almost to have vied with each other in trying who would misunderstand it most. Strangely enough, all the earlier expositors down to Lücke inclusive have taken the first thirty-seven shepherds to mean the native kings of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah! It is true no doubt that in the present day all are agreed that the seventy shepherds are intended to represent the period during which Israel was subjected to the sway of the Gentile powers. But it is a strange misapprehension, into which almost all the expositors have been betrayed, when they suppose that the seventy shepherds are intended to represent a corresponding number of Gentile rulers. The whole narrative leaves no room whatever to doubt, *that the shepherds are rather to be understood as angels* who are entrusted with the duty of seeing that only as many

of the sheep are torn to pieces as God intends and no more. So far as I am aware, up till the publication of the first edition of the present work, Von Hofmann was the only writer who recognised this (*Schriftbeweis*, i. 422).¹⁵ It is, as it is impossible to doubt, the wild beasts and the birds of prey that represent the Gentile rulers. Consequently the shepherds must have some other meaning altogether. But they certainly cannot be taken as representing human beings, for throughout the entire vision these latter are, without exception, represented under the symbolism of animals, whereas the angels appear even in chap. lxxxvii. under that of men. And that the shepherds are as matter of fact intended to represent angels is still further confirmed by what follows: (1) Before they commence to tend the flock they *all* appear before God *at one and the same time*, and from Him receive their commission to feed the flock one after the other (lxxxix. 59). How could this apply to Gentile rulers? Or are we to think of them as in a pre-existent state? (2) At the judgment they are classed along with the fallen angels (xc. 20 sqq.). (3) The angel that is summoned to write down the number of sheep that are destroyed is in lxxxix. 61 briefly spoken of as "another," which would surely justify us in assuming that the shepherds mentioned immediately before belong to precisely the same category as this "other." (4) Nor can the shepherds be identified with the Gentile rulers for this further reason, that according to lxxxix. 75 they are also entrusted with the duty of protecting the sheep from the wild beasts. Consequently they are evidently an impartial power placed over the sheep and the wild beasts alike, or they are meant to be so at least.¹⁶ The thought in the author's mind then is this, that from the moment that in

¹⁵ Since then this view has been endorsed by Kesselring (*Lit. Centralbl.* 1874, p. 133), Drummond (*The Jewish Messiah*, p. 40 sqq.) and Wieseler (*Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* 1882, p. 186).

¹⁶ Even in the later Jewish Haggadah we meet with the idea that seventy angels were set over the Gentile world, that is to say one over each

accordance with the divine purpose Israel was assailed and subjugated by the Gentile powers, God appointed angels whose duty it was to see that these powers executed upon Israel the judgment with which He intended them to be visited ; and not only so, but also to see that they did not oppress and persecute Israel unduly. But the watchers neglect their duty ; they allow the wild beasts to destroy a greater number than they ought to have done, and, as is predicted toward the conclusion, they are for this to be cast into hell-fire along with the fallen angels.

It would lead to too great a digression were we to do more in the way of refuting the misapprehensions here in question. We must content ourselves with briefly stating what—following Dillmann and Ewald above all—we conceive to be the correct interpretation. The numbers in the text serve to show that the author divides the time of the duration of the Gentile supremacy into *four periods* arranged thus : 12 + 23 + 23 + 12, which are simply intended to denote in a general way two shorter periods (at the beginning) and two longer ones (in the middle). For every calculation pretending to chronological exactness must be radically erroneous, whether, with Hilgenfeld, we take year-weeks or, with Volkmar, take decades as our basis. Nor can there be any doubt as to where the different periods are intended to begin and end. The *first* begins with the time when the Gentile powers (consequently that of Assyria in the first instance) began to turn against Israel, and extends to the time of the return of the exiles in the reign of Cyrus, the only difficulty here being as to who are meant by the three returning sheep (lxxxix. 72). Probably the author here alludes to Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, the less prominent colleague of Zerubbabel, viz. Joshua, being left out of account. The *second* period extends of the seventy Gentile nations. See *Targum of Jonathan* on Deut. xxxii. 8. *Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer*, chap. xxiv. Wagenseil's note on *Sota* vii. 5 (in Surenhusius's *Mishna*, iii. 263 sq.). Schegg, *Evangelium nach Lukas übers. und erklärt*, ii. 69. Also the expositors generally on Luke x. 1.

from Cyrus to Alexander the Great. For the substitution of the birds of prey for the wild beasts (xc. 2) plainly marks the transition from the Persians to the Greeks. The *third* extends from Alexander the Great to Antiochus Epiphanes. Nothing but stubborn prejudice can prevent any one from seeing that, by the symbolism of the lambs (xc. 6), the Maccabees are to be understood. Lastly, the *fourth* period extends from the commencement of the Maccabæan age on to the author's own day. That, everything considered, this latter coincides with the time of the Hasmonæan princes it is impossible to doubt. And it is very likely that, by the great horn which is mentioned last, it is John Hyrcanus that is referred to. Only we feel bound to agree with Gebhardt, who, owing to the uncertain character of the Ethiopic text, warns us against being too detailed in our interpretation. But (seeing that from the beginning of the Maccabæan age onwards the times of twelve shepherds had elapsed) this may be regarded as certain, *that the author wrote some time in the last third of the second century B.C.* If we compare the $12 + 23 + 23 + 12$ times, that are put down to represent the four periods, with the actual duration of those periods, we will find that, for the eye of the author looking backwards, the length of the time is foreshortened. He represents the third period (333–175 B.C.) as being of precisely the same length as the second, whereas in point of fact this latter was considerably longer (537–333 B.C.). And for his eye the first period dwindles down still more. All this is exactly what we might expect in the case of one who is looking back upon the events of the past.

If we were to be allowed to assume that the author of the historical vision is, in the main, the author of chaps. i.–xxxvi., lxxii.–cv. as well, then the date of the composition of the whole of those sections would thereby be determined at the same time.

2. *The allegories*, chaps. xxxvii.–lxxi. (with the exception of the Noachian portions). Even on a hasty perusal one

cannot fail to notice that the allegories form one distinct whole, and that they are different from the remaining portions of the book. In fact there cannot be the slightest doubt but that they are the production of a different author. The use of the names of God, the angelology, the eschatology, and the doctrine of the Messiah differ essentially from those of the rest of the book (comp. especially Köstlin, pp. 265–268). And as little can there be any room to doubt that they are of a *later date* than the original work. For the favourite notion of Ewald, that they rank first in point of time, has been sufficiently refuted by Köstlin (pp. 269–273). Among the peculiarities of the allegories we notice this in particular, that a decided prominence is given in them to the Messianic hope and the person of the Messiah, whereas, in the other parts of the book, those are matters that are touched on once or twice at the most. This again is connected with a further peculiarity to which Köstlin in particular has directed attention, namely, that here, instead of its being the wicked and the ungodly in general who appear in contrast to the pious, as is the case in the rest of the book, it is rather the Gentile rulers, the kings and the powerful ones of the earth (chaps. xxxviii. 4, 5, xlvi. 7, 8, xlviii. 8–10, liii. 5, liv. 2, lv. 4, lxii. 1, 3, 6, 9–11, lxiii. 1–12). This circumstance serves to explain why it is that precisely in these allegories such decided prominence is given to the Messianic hope. But when, it may now be asked, were they composed? The only passage which furnishes any clue to the date is chap. lvi., where it is predicted that, in the closing period, the Parthians and Medes would come from the east and invade the Holy Land, but that they would encounter obstacles at the holy city, when they would turn upon and destroy each other (lvi. 5–7). When Köstlin would have us infer from this passage that the writing here in question must have been composed previous to the year 64 B.C., as otherwise we should have expected that the Romans would have been mentioned as well, we may reply that such an expectation is absolutely

groundless and unwarrantable. It would be much nearer the truth to conclude, with Lücke, that this passage presupposes what had already taken place, viz. the Parthian invasion of Palestine (40–38 B.C.), the recollection of which would have some influence in shaping the author's eschatological hopes, so that, according to this, the allegories would be composed *at the very soonest in the time of Herod*. On the other hand, the prediction to the effect that the Parthian power would collapse outside the walls of Jerusalem, presupposes that the city was still standing, as otherwise it would surely have been necessary first of all to predict its restoration. But the main question now is this, are the allegories of pre- or of post-Christian origin? An answer to this question is all the more desirable, that it is precisely in these that we find so many points of contact with the Christology and eschatology of the Gospels. But unfortunately it is extremely difficult to arrive at any positive decision. However, this much at least ought to be admitted, that the view of the Messiah presented in the part of the book at present under consideration is perfectly explicable on Jewish grounds, and that, to account for such view, it is not necessary to assume that it was due to Christian influences. Nothing of a specifically Christian character is to be met with in any part of this section. But, supposing the reverse to have been the case, it is, to say the least of it, quite incredible that a Jew would have been likely to have borrowed it, and so there would be nothing for it but to pronounce at once in favour of a *Christian* origin. And this is what has actually been done by all those who cannot see their way to admit the pre-Christian origin of the writing (Hofmann, Weisse, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Philippi). But no sooner is such a view seriously entertained than the difficulties begin to accumulate. An anonymous Christian author would scarcely have been so reserved as to avoid making any allusion to the historical personality of Jesus. Surely if the writer had any object in view at all it would be to win converts to the faith. But how could he hope to accomplish

this object, if he always spoke merely of the coming of the Messiah in glory, merely of "the Chosen One" as the Judge of the world, without making the slightest reference to the fact that, in the first place, He would have to appear in His estate of humiliation? Surely any one who candidly weighs the arguments on the one side and on the other must feel constrained to admit that the pre-Christian origin is decidedly more probable than the Christian one. Further, the objection based upon the circumstance that, according to Matt. xvi. 13-16, John xii. 34, the expression "Son of man" was not as yet a current designation for the Messiah in the time of Christ, whereas it is of frequent occurrence in this sense in the allegories, is without force. For we are by no means at liberty to infer from those passages that the expression "Son of man" was not at that time currently in use as a Messianic title. In the case of the passage in John this inference is based simply upon false exegesis (see, on the other hand, Meyer for example). The passage in Matthew again is disposed of by the circumstance that, in its original form as preserved in Mark viii. 27 = Luke ix. 18, the expression "Son of man" does not occur at all.

3. *The Noachian portions.* The investigations of Dillmann, Ewald, and Köstlin have already sufficiently proved that the passages liv. 7-lv. 2, lx. 65-lxix. 25 break the sequence, and were only inserted among the allegories at a later period. And if further proof were needed, we have it in the fact that in chap. lxviii. 1, "The Book of the Allegories of Enoch" is expressly quoted. Those portions have been called Noachian, partly because they treat of Noah and his time, and partly because they purport to have been written by him. Probably chaps. cvi., cvii. should also be included among them. Chap. cviii. is an independent addition inserted at a later period. It is utterly impossible to say at what dates those various interpolations were made.

The whole Book of Enoch, which was gradually put together in the way we have just stated, undoubtedly owes

its origin to Palestine (comp. Dillmann, *Einleitung*, p. 51). But as our present Ethiopic version is taken from the Greek, it becomes a question whether this latter was the original or whether it was in turn a translation from the Hebrew or Aramaic. Certainly the numerous Hebrew names of the angels point to this latter as probable, to say nothing of the fact that, in the Hasmonaeon age, Greek was hardly ever used for literary purposes. Consequently it has been almost universally assumed that the original was composed in Hebrew or Aramaic.¹⁷ The only exceptions are Volkmar (*Zeitschr. der DMG.* 1860, p. 131) and Philippi (p. 126), who feel compelled to adopt the view that Greek was the language of the original.

For the Enoch-legend generally, comp. (next to Gen. v. 18-24) Jesus the Son of Sirach xliv. 16, xlix. 14; Heb. xi. 5; Irenaeus, v. 5. 1; Tertulian, *De anima*, chap. 1; Hippolyt. *De Christo et Antichristo*, chaps. xliii.-xlvii.; *Evang. Nicodemi* (= *Acta Pilati*), chap. xxv.; *Historia Josephi* (apocr.), chaps. xxx.-xxxii. Thilo, *Codex apocr. Nov. Test.* p. 766 sqq. Rud. Hofmann, *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen*, p. 459 sqq. Winer, *Realwörterb.* art. "Enoch." Hamburger, *Real-Encycl. für Bibel und Talmud*, Part ii. art. "Enochsage." The Bible dictionaries generally. The expositors on Revelation xi. For a great number of earlier dissertations, consult Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 222 sq.

To an acquaintance with our book is perhaps to be traced so early a notice as that of a Jewish or Samaritan Hellenist (probably not Eupolemus, but some person unknown, see § xxxiii.) which has been transmitted to us by Alexander Polyhistor, and after him by Eusebius, to the effect that Enoch was the inventor of astrology (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 17. 8, ed. Gaisford: τοῦτον εὐρηκέναι πρῶτον τὴν ἀστρολογίαν). In the Book of Jubilees not only is our book largely drawn upon, but expressly mentioned (see Ewald's *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* ii. 240 sq., iii. 18 sq., 90 sq. Rönisch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, p. 403 sqq.). In the following nine passages in the *Test. XII. Patr.* express reference is made to Enoch's prophetic writings: Simeon v.; Levi x. 14, 16; Judah xviii.; Zebulon iii.; Dan v.; Naphtali iv.; Benjamin ix. Further, the mention of the *ἰγγήγορες* (watchers = angels) in Reuben v., Naphtali iii., may also be said to point to Enoch.

Christian testimonies: *Epist. of Jude*, 14: ἐπροφῆτισεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἰσδομοῖς ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ ἕως λέγει κ.τ.λ. *Epist. of Barnabas* iv.: τὸ τέλειον σκάνδαλον ἤγγικεν περὶ οὗ γίγρεται, ὡς ἕως λέγει. *Ibid.* xvi.: λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή (then follows a quotation from the Book of Enoch). Irenaeus

¹⁷ For the view that the original was in Hebrew, see in particular Hallévi, *Journal Asiatique*, 1867, April-May, pp. 352-395.

iv. 16. 2: Sed et Enoch sine circumcisione placens Deo, cum esset homo, Dei legatione ad angelos fungebatur et translatus est et conservatur usque nunc testis iusti iudicii Dei. Tertullian, *De cultu feminarum*, l. 3: Scio scripturam Enoch, quae hunc ordinem angelis dedit, non recipi a quibusdam, quia nec in armarium Judaicum admittitur. Opinor, non putaverunt illum ante cataclysmum editam post eum casum orbis omnium rerum abolitorem salvam esse potuisse. . . . Tertullian then goes on to point out how this was still quite possible, after which he proceeds as follows: Sed cum Enoch eadem scriptura etiam de domino praedicarit, a nobis quidem nihil omnino rejiciendum est, quod pertineat ad nos. Et legimus omnem scripturam aedificationi habilem divinitus inspirari. A Judaeis potest jam videri propterea rejecta, sicut et cetera fere quae Christum sonant. . . . Eo accedit, quod Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet. Comp. besides the whole of the introduction to chap. ii., the subject of which is taken from Enoch. Idem, *De cultu feminarum*, ii. 10: (idem angeli) damnati a deo sunt, ut Enoch refert. Idem, *De idololatr.* iv.: Antecesserat Enoch praedicens, etc. Idem, *De idololatr.* xv.: Haec igitur ab initio praevidens spiritus sanctus (!) etiam ostia in superstitionem ventura praececinat per antiquissimum propheten Enoch. Clemens Alex. *Eclogae prophet.* chap. ii. (Dindorf, iii. 456): "Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐ βλήσαν ἀβύσσους, καθήμενος ἐπὶ Χερουβίμ" ὁ Δανιὴλ λέγει ὁμοδοξῶν τῷ Ἐνῶχ τῷ εἰρηκέντι "καὶ εἶδον τὰς ὕλας πάσας." Idem, *Eclogae prophet.* chap. liii. (Dindorf, iii. 474): ἦν δὲ καὶ Ἐνῶχ φησὶν τοὺς παραβάοντας ἀγγέλους διδάξαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἀστρονομίας καὶ μαθητικῆν καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τέχνας. Celsus, in Origen, *Contra Cels.* v. 52, endeavours to show that Christians would contradict themselves were they to maintain that Christ was the only ἀγγέλος sent down into the world by God. As evidence of this he quotes the following words: ἰδοὺν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλους λίγοντι πολλάν τις καὶ ὁμοῦ γε ἐξήκοντα ἢ ἑβδομήκοντα· οὗς δὲ γινώσκει κακοὺς καὶ κολάζεσθαι θεομοίς ὑποβληθέντας ἐν γῇ· ὅθεν καὶ τὰς θερμαῖς πηγὰς εἶναι τὰ ἐκείνων δάκρυα κ.τ.λ. In commenting on this passage Origen (*Contra Cels.* v. 54, 55) remarks that it is taken from the Book of Enoch. He thinks however that Celsus did not read it there himself, but heard it from somebody or other, for he does not mention the author's name. Origen, *Contra Cels.* v. 54: ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ὡς πάντων φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγινωσκόμενα τοῦ Ἐνῶχ βιβλία (observe the plural). Idem, *De principiis*, i. 3. 8: Sed et in Enoch libro his similia describuntur. Idem, *De principiis*, iv. 35: Sed et in libro suo Enoch ita ait: "Ambulavi usque ad imperfectum" . . . scriptum namque est in eodem libello dicente Enoch: "Universas materias perspexi." Idem, *In Numer. homil.* xxviii. 2 (de la Rue, ii. 384=Lommatzsch, x. 366): De quibus quidem nominibus plurima in libellis, qui appellantur Enoch, secreta continentur et arcana: sed quia libelli isti non videntur apud Hebraeos in auctoritate haberi, interim nunc ea, quae ibi nominantur, ad exemplum vocare differamus. Idem, *In Joannem*, vol. vi. chap. xxv. (de la Rue, iv. 142=Lommatzsch, i. 241): ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἐνῶχ γίνεσθαι, εἰ τὸ φέρον παραδέχσθαι ὡς ἁγίου τὸ βιβλίον. Anatolius in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 19: Τοῦ δὲ τῶν πρῶτον παρ' Ἑβραίοις μῆναι περὶ ἰσημερινῶν εἶναι, παραστατικὰ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῷ Ἐνῶχ μαθήματα. Jerome, *De viris illustr.*

chap. iv.: Judas frater Jacobi parvam, quae de septem catholicis est, epistolam reliquit. Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonia a plerisque rejicitur, etc. Idem, *Comment. in Epist. ad Titum*, i. 12 (Vallarsi, vii. 1. 708): Qui autem putant totum librum debere sequi eum, qui libri parte usus sit, videntur mihi et apocryphum Enoch, de quo apostolus Judas in epistola sua testimonium posuit, inter ecclesiae scripturas recipere. In the so-called stichometry of Nicephorus and in the *Synopsis Athanasii*, the Book of Enoch is classed with the Apocrypha (Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, pp. 121, 145). So also in the anonymous list of the canonical books which has been edited by Montfaucon, Cotelier, Hody, and Pitra respectively (see v. 7 below). *Constit. apostol.* vi. 16: καὶ ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς δὲ τινες συνήγαγαν βιβλία ἀπόκρυφα Μωϋσέως καὶ Ἐνὸχ καὶ Ἀδὰμ Ἡσαίου τε καὶ Δαβὶδ καὶ Ἡλίας καὶ τῶν τριῶν πατριάρχων, Φθороποιδ καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας ἱχθύα. For yet other testimonia patrum, consult Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 160–223, ii. 55–61. Philippi, *Das Buch Henoch*, p. 102 sqq. Also the two large fragments from Syncellus in Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch*, pp. 82–86.

Editions of the Ethiopic text: Laurence, *Libri Enoch versio Aethiopica*, Oxoniae 1838. Dillmann, *Liber Henoch Aethiopice, ad quinque codicum fidem editus, cum variis lectionibus*, Lipsiae 1851.

Versions: (1) English ones: Laurence, *The Book of Enoch, an apocryphal production supposed to have been lost for ages, but discovered at the close of the last century in Abyssinia, now first translated from an Ethiopic MS. in the Bodleian Library*, Oxford 1821. Schodde, *The Book of Enoch, translated with Introduction and Notes*, Andover 1882. (2) German ones: Hoffmann (Andreas Gottlieb), *Das Buch Henoch in vollständiger Uebersetzung mit fortlaufendem Commentar, ausführlicher Einleitung und erläuternden Excursen*, 2 vols. Jena 1833–1838. Dillmann, *Das Buch Henoch, übersetzt und erklärt*, Leipzig 1853.

Critical inquiries: Laurence in his English translation. Hoffmann (Andr. Gottl.), art. "Enoch," in Ersch and Gruber's *Encycl.* § 2, vol. v. (1829) pp. 399–409. Idem, in his German translation. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils* (also under the title, *Gesch. des Urchristenthums*, vol. i.–ii. 1838), i. 93–109. Wieseler, *Die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des Propheten Daniel*, 1839, p. 162 sqq. Krieger (Lützelberger), *Beiträge zur Kritik und Exegese*, Nürnberg 1845. Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes* (2nd ed. 1852), pp. 89–144; comp. 1171–1173. Hofmann (J. Chr. K.), "Ueber die Entstehungszeit des Buch Henoch" (*Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* vol. vi. 1852, pp. 87–91). Idem, *Schriftbeweis* (2nd ed.), i. 420–423. Idem, *Die heil. Schrift N. T.'s zusammenhängend untersucht*, vii. 2, p. 205 sqq. Dillmann in his German translation. Idem, in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xii. 308–310. Idem, *Zeitschr. DMG.* 1861, pp. 126–131. Idem, in Schenkel's *Bibellez.* iii. (1871) pp. 10–13. Idem, in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. (1883) pp. 350–352. Ewald, "Abhandlung über des äthiopischen Buches Henókh Entstehung, Sinn und Zusammensetzung" (*Abhandlungen der königl. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Göttingen*, vol. vi. 1853–1855, Historico-philosoph. section, pp. 107–178. Also separate reprint). Idem, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 3rd

ed. iv. 451 sqq. Weiss, *Die Evangelienfrage* (1856), pp. 214-224. Köstlin, "Ueber die Entstehung des Buchs Henoch" (*Theol. Jahrbücher* 1856, pp. 240-279, 370-386). Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalypik* (1857), pp. 91-184. Idem, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* vol. iii. 1860, pp. 319-334; iv. 1861, pp. 212-222; v. 1862, pp. 216-221; xv. 1872, pp. 584-587. Volkmar, "Beiträge zur Erklärung des Buches Henoch nach dem äthiopischen Text" (*Zeitschr. der DMG.*, vol. xiv. 1860, pp. 87-134, 296). Idem, in *Der Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* vol. iv. 1861, pp. 111-136, 422 sqq.; v. 1862, p. 46 sqq. Idem, *Eine Neutestamentliche Entdeckung und deren Bestreitung, oder die Geschichts-Vision des Buches Henoch im Zusammenhang*, Zürich 1862. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, for year 1864-65, pp. 196-204. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 35-64. Sieffert, *Nonnulla ad apocryphi libri Henochi originem et compositionem nec non ad opiniones de regno Messiano eo prolatas pertinentia*, Regimonti Pr. 1867 (the same work under the title, *De apocryphi libri Henochi origine et argumento*, Regimonti Pr. s. a.). Hallévi, "Recherches sur la langue de la rédaction primitive du livre d'Enoch" (*Journal asiatique*, 1867, April-May, pp. 352-395). Philippi, *Das Buch Henoch, sein Zeitalter und sein Verhältniss zum Judasbriefe*, Stuttg. 1868. Wittichen, *Die Idee des Menschen* (1868), pp. 63-71. Idem, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes* (1872), pp. 118-133, 145-148, 149 sq. Gebhardt, "Die 70 Hirten des Buches Henoch und ihre Deutungen mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Barkochba-Hypothese" (*Merx' Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T.* vol. ii. part 2, 1872, pp. 163-246). Tideman, "De apocalypse van Henoch en het Essenisme" (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1875, pp. 261-296). Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (1877), pp. 17-73. Lipsius, art. "Enoch," in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. ii. (1880) pp. 124-128. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, § 498-500. Wieseler, "Zur Abfassungszeit des Buchs Henoch" (*Zeitschr. der DMG.* 1882, pp. 185-193).

3. The Assumptio Mosis.

It had long been known from a passage in Origen (*De princip.* iii. 2. 1) that the legend referred to in the Epistle of Jude (ver. 9) regarding a dispute between the archangel Michael and Satan about the body of Moses, was taken from an apocryphal book entitled the *Ascensio Mosis*. Some little information regarding this *Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως* had also been gleaned from quotations found in the Fathers and subsequent writers (see below). But it was not till somewhat recently that a large portion of this work in an old Latin version was discovered in the Ambrosian Library at Milan by Ceriani, and published by him (1861) in the first part of his *Monumenta*.

It is true the fragment bears no title, but its identity with the old *Ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως* is evident from the following quotation (*Acta Synodi Nicaenae*, ii. 18, in Fabricius, i. 845): *Μέλλων ὁ προφήτης Μωυσῆς ἐξίεναι τοῦ βίου, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ Ἀναλήψεως Μωυσέως, προσκαλεσάμενος Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν Ναυῆ καὶ διαλεγόμενος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔφη· Καὶ προσεδάσατό με ὁ θεὸς πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου εἶναί με τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ μεσίτην.* These same words also occur in Ceriani's fragment, i. 14: *Itaque excogitavit et invenit me, qui ab initio orbis terrarum praeparatus sum, ut sim arbiter testamenti illius.* Since its publication by Ceriani this writing has been edited by Hilgenfeld (*Clementis Romani Epist.* 1866, 2nd ed. 1876), Volkmar (Latin and German, 1867), Schmidt and Merx (Merx' *Archiv*, 1868), and Fritzsche (*Libri apocr.* 1871). A rendering back into the Greek from which the Latin version had been taken was executed by Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr.* 1868, and *Messias Judaeorum*, 1869).

The following is an outline of the contents of the writing (and here we adopt Hilgenfeld's division of the chapters, which is also adhered to by Schmidt-Merx and Fritzsche, and departed from by Volkmar alone):—

Chap. i. 1–9. The introduction, in which we are given to understand that what follows was an *address which Moses gave to Joshua* when he appointed him to be his successor at Ammon beyond Jordan. In i. 10–17 Moses discloses to Joshua the fact that the course of his life has come to an end, and that he is on the point of departing to his fathers. By way of legacy he hands over to Joshua certain books of prophecies which he is requested to preserve in a place appointed by God for the purpose. In chap. ii. Moses reveals to Joshua in brief outline the future history of Israel, from the entrance into Palestine down to the destruction of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah. In chap. iii. it is stated that a king (Nebuchadnezzar) will come from the east and destroy the city and the temple with fire, and carry away the inhabitants into his own domains. The captives will then remember that

all this had been already foretold by Moses. Chap. iv. In answer to the prayers of a man who is over them (Daniel), God will again take pity upon them and raise up a king (Cyrus), who will allow them to return to their native land. A few fragments of the tribes will return and will rebuild the holy place, and will remain steadfast in their allegiance to the Lord, only sad and sighing because they cannot sacrifice to the God of their fathers.¹⁸ Chap. v. And judgment will overtake their kings (their Gentile rulers). But they themselves (the Jews) will be divided in regard to the truth.¹⁹ And the altar will be defiled by men who are not (true) priests, but slaves born of slaves. And their scribes (magistri [et] doctores eorum) will be partial and will pervert justice. And their land will be full of unrighteousness. Chap. vi. Then kings will arise among them, and priests of the Most High God will be appointed, who will nevertheless commit wickedness even in the very holy of holies itself (plainly alluding to the Hasmonaeans). And these will be succeeded by an insolent monarch not belonging to the family of the priests, an arrogant and ungodly man. And he will deal with those who have preceded him as they deserve. He will cut off their proud ones with the sword, and bury their bodies in secret places so that nobody will know where they have been laid.²⁰ He will put to death old and young alike, and will not spare. Then there will be great dread of him among them throughout the land, and he will sit in judgment upon them, as did the Egyptians, for *four-and-thirty years* (all which obviously points to Herod the Great). And he will

¹⁸ The author seems to think that the sacrificial worship of the second temple could not be regarded as true worship owing to their being under Gentile supremacy, and because the conducting of the worship was in the hands of priests friendly to the Greeks.

¹⁹ Hilgenfeld has correctly held that the words "Et ipsi dividuntur ad veritatem" are to be regarded as beginning a new sentence. Schmidt and Merx have given a happy reproduction of the Greek text in the words *Καὶ αὐτοὶ διαμερισθήσονται πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν* (comp. Luke xi. 17).

²⁰ Comp. Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 10. 4: πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ Φανερῶς καὶ λεληθότως εἰς τὸ φρούριον ἀναγόμενοι, τὴν Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ διεφθείροντο.

beget sons who will reign, though for shorter periods, as his successors. Cohorts of soldiers will come into their land, and a powerful monarch of the West (Quintilius Varus), who will conquer them and take them captive, and destroy a part of their temple with fire, while some of them he will crucify around their city.²¹ Chap. vii. After this will come the end of the times. Their course will have run after the expiry of yet four hours . . . (then follow several lines in the manuscript that are hardly legible). And there will reign among them wicked and ungodly men, who say that they are righteous. They are deceitful men, who will live only to please themselves, dissemblers in all their concerns, and at every hour of the day lovers of feasts, mere gluttons . . . (here again follows a hiatus). They devour the possessions of the poor, and declare that they do this out of pity. Their hands and their minds indulge in impurity, and their mouth utters high-sounding things; and further, they say, "touch me not lest thou defile me." . . . Chap. viii. Vengeance and wrath will come upon them, such as has never been among them from the beginning till the time when he will raise up to them the king of kings (Antiochus Epiphanes), who will crucify those who profess circumcision, and will cause them to get their children uncircumcised again, and to carry about the impure idols in public, and to condemn the word. Chap. ix. Then, in obedience to the command of that king, there will appear a man of the tribe of Levi, whose name will be *tazo*, who will have seven sons, to whom he will say: Behold, my sons, vengeance has once more come upon the people, a cruel vengeance without one touch of pity. For what nation

²¹ According to Fritzsche's amended form of it, the passage runs thus: Et producet natos (qui succedentes sibi [=ei] breviora tempora dominarent [cod. donarent]). In partes eorum cohortes [cod. mortis] venient et occidentis rex potens, qui expugnabit eos, et ducet captivos, et partem aedis ipsorum igni incendet, aliquos crucifiget circa coloniam eorum. Comp. with regard to the burning of the temple, Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 10. 2; and, for the crucifixions, *Antt.* xvii. 10. 10. What is in view therefore is the war of Varus in the year 4 B.C.

of the ungodly has ever had to endure anything equal to what has befallen us? Now listen, my sons, and let us do this: Let us fast three days, and on the fourth let us go into a cave which is in the field and die there rather than transgress the commandments of our Lord, the God of our fathers.²² Chap. x. And then will His kingdom appear throughout His whole creation. Then will the devil have an end, and sorrow will disappear along with him. For the Heavenly One will rise up from His throne. And the earth will tremble, the sun will withhold its light, and the horns of the moon will be broken. For God the Most High will appear and He will punish the Gentiles. Then wilt thou be happy, O Israel, and God will exalt thee. And now, Joshua (and here Moses turns again to address his successor), keep these words and this book. As for me, I am going to the resting-place of my fathers. Chap. xi. then goes on to relate how, after this address was ended, Joshua turned to Moses and lamented over the prospect of his departure, and regretted that, in consequence of his own weakness and incompetency, he would not be equal to the great task that had been imposed upon him. Thereupon chap. xii. proceeds to tell how Moses

²² It is usually assumed that chaps. viii.-ix. have direct reference to the closing period. But this appears to be only indirectly the case. For the author represents Moses as prophesying that, in the closing period, there will be a state of matters the like of which will never have been before except once, viz. in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. It is the description of this period of persecution under Antiochus that is also pursued in chap. ix., in which we accordingly meet with a legend similar to that in 2 Macc. vii. The object of the hiding in the cave is not merely to escape persecution, but also to find a place where the law can be observed without hindrance; comp. in particular 2 Macc. vi. 11 and the Rabbinical legends regarding Simon ben Jochai (Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 470 sqq.); also in general, Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, p. 128. There has been an unnecessary amount of puzzling of the brains over the enigmatical term *taxo*. It is undoubtedly to be looked upon as a corruption of the text. But one is at a loss to conceive how Hilgenfeld could ever suppose that under it there lay a reference to the Messiah. That would surely be a strange Messiah who could find nothing better to do than creep into a hole and there await the approach of death. Yet, according to Philippi, this latter is to be understood as referring to Christ and His disciples (pp. 177-180).

exhorted Joshua not to under-estimate his ability and not to despair of the future of his people, seeing that, however much they might be punished for their sins, they could never be utterly destroyed.

Here the manuscript ends. But all that has gone before leads us to expect, what the fragments tend to confirm, that in the subsequent portion of the book it had gone on to give an account of how Moses was taken away from the earth, the scene from which the whole work obtained the title of the *Ἀνάληψις Μωϋσέως*. It is also in this concluding part of the work that the dispute between the archangel Michael and Satan about the body of Moses must have occurred, which dispute, as is well known, is also mentioned in verse 9 of the Epistle of Jude.

Opinion is very much divided regarding the date of the composition of this book. Ewald, Wieseler, Drummond and Dillmann refer it to the first decade after the death of Herod; Hilgenfeld calculates that it may have been written in the course of the year 44–45 A.D.; Schmidt and Merx say some time between 54 and 64 A.D.; Fritzsche and Lucius trace it to the sixth decade of the first century A.D.; Langen thinks it must have been shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus (chap. viii. being erroneously interpreted as referring to this event); Hausrath prefers the reign of Domitian; Philippi, the second century of our era (the latter fixing on this date solely with the object of his being able to ascribe the authorship to a *Christian*, and of reversing the relation in which our book and ver. 9 of the Epistle of Jude stand to each other; see in particular, pp. 177, 182); while Volkmar (in accordance with his well-known predilection for the time of Barcocheba) thinks the date would be some time in the course of the year 137–138 A.D. Almost the whole of the critics just mentioned base their calculation upon the well-nigh illegible fragments of numbers in chap. vii. But surely one may fairly question the propriety of trying to found anything whatever upon lines so mutilated as those are; and if we had

no other data but these to help us to fix the date in question, we would have nothing for it but to abandon the attempt altogether. Still I cannot help thinking that there are two such data at our disposal. (1) Toward the end of chap. vi. it is plainly stated that the sons of Herod are to reign for a shorter period (*breviora tempora*) than their father. Now it is well known that Philip and Antipas reigned longer than their father; and one cannot help seeing the embarrassment to which those words have led in the case of all those critics who refer the composition of our book to a latish date. They are capable of being explained solely on the assumption that the work was written toward the commencement of the reign of the last-mentioned princes. (2) It is as good as universally admitted that the concluding sentences of chap. vi. refer to the war of Varus in the year 4 B.C.²³ When therefore chap. vii. goes on to say: *Ex quo facto finientur tempora*, surely there can hardly be room for any other inference than this, that the author wrote subsequent to the war of Varus. In that case the enigmatical numbers that follow in this same chapter cannot be supposed to be a continuation of the narrative, but are to be regarded as a calculation added by way of supplement after the narrative has been brought down to the date at which the author was writing. Only, considering how mutilated those numbers are, every attempt to explain them must prove a failure. Consequently the view of Ewald, Wieseler, Drummond and Dillmann with regard to the date of the composition of our book is substantially correct.

Some light is thrown upon the author's *party leanings*, partly by chap. vii. and partly by chap. x. The *homines pestilentiosi* against whom he inveighs in chap. vii. are by no means the Herodian princes (so Hilgenfeld), nor the Sadducees

²³ So Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Schmidt-Merx, Wieseler, Dillmann and others, also Langen, *Theol. Literaturbl.* 1871, No. 3, Sp. 90 (where he retracts his previous absolutely untenable reference of the passage to Pompey; see *Judenth. in Paläst.* p. 109).

(so Volkmar, p. 105; Geiger, p. 45 sq.; Lucius, p. 116 sqq.), nor the Sadducees and Pharisees (so Wieseler, p. 642 sq., who refers vv. 3, 4 to the former and vv. 6–10 to the latter); but the Pharisees and the Pharisees alone, to whom every word is unmistakably applicable (so Ewald, *Gesch.* v. 81; Schmidt-Merx, p. 121; Philippi, p. 176). Our author then was *inimical to the Pharisees*, though, at the same time, he was neither an Essene, for as such he would not have jeered, as he does in chap. vii., at the Pharisaical purifications (Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 10), nor a Sadducee, for, according to chap. x., he looks forward with the most fervent longings for the advent of the kingdom of God, and that too a kingdom accompanied with outward pomp and circumstance. Wieseler is perhaps nearest the truth in seeking him among the Zealots who, notwithstanding their kinship to the Pharisees, had still an intense dislike to them, because they looked upon them as being too dogmatic and formal as regards the law and too undecided with respect to their politics. That the book was written in Palestine may, to say the least of it, be accepted as the most obvious and natural supposition. Hilgenfeld and Hausrath have suggested Rome, without however alleging any ground for doing so. On the assumption that it was composed in Palestine, it becomes further probable that it was written originally in Hebrew or Aramaic. But we are not in a position positively to assert this. Only this much is certain, that our old Latin version was taken from the Greek.

Of the legend regarding the death of Moses extensive and varied use has been made in Jewish literature. Besides our book there fall to be mentioned: Philo (*Vita Mosis*), Josephus (*Antt.* iv. *fin.*), *Midrash Tanchuma debarum* (translated into German by Wünsche, 1882), and a *Midrash* which treats specially of the departure of Moses (פְּסִירַת מֹשֶׁה, *Petirath Moshe*). This latter has been frequently published in two recensions, among others by Gilb. Gaulminius, Paris 1629, with a Latin translation; then this Latin translation was published by itself by John Alb. Fabricius, Hamburg 1714, and by Gfrörer, *Prophetæ veteres pseudepigraphi*, Stuttg. 1840 (see Wolf, *Bibliotheca Hebraea*, ii. 1278 sq., 1395. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 146. Steinschneider, *Catal. librorum Hebraeorum in Biblioth. Bodl.* p. 630 sq.). For one of these two recensions see also

Jellinek, *Beth ha-Midrash*, vol. i. 1858. Also a third, which Jellinek regards as the oldest, in his *Beth ha-Midrash*, vol. vi. 1877. Comp. in general on these legends: Bernard's edition of Josephus, note on *Ant.* iv. fin. Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 839 sqq. Beer, *Leben Moses nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage*, Leipzig 1863. Benedetti, *Vita e morte di Mosè, leggenda ebr. tradotta, illustrata e comparata*, Pisa 1879 (on which see *Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1881, pp. 57–60). Leop. v. Ranke, *Weltgeschichte*, vol. iii. 2nd part (1888), pp. 12–83.

Care must be taken not to confound our *Assumptio Mosis* with the Christian *Apocalypse of Moses* in Greek which has been edited by Tischendorf (*Apocalypses apocryphae*, Lips. 1866); similarly, from a Milanese manuscript, by Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana*, v. 1. This work belongs to the class of Adamic books, for it records the history of the life and death of Adam as it had been revealed to Moses. On this comp. Tischendorf, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1851, p. 482 sqq. Le Hir, *Etudes Bibliques* (1869), ii. pp. 110–120. Röscher, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, p. 470 sqq. According to Euthalius and others, Gal. vi. 15 (ὅτι περιτομή τι ἴσους οὗτος ἀπερὸς ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν κτλ.) found a place in an *Apocryphum Mosis*, where, of course, it could only have been borrowed from the Epistle to the Galatians (Euthalius in Zaccagni's *Collectanea monumentorum veterum*, 1698, p. 561 = Gallandi, *Biblioth. Patr.* x. 260. Similarly Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 48, and an anonymous list of the quotations in the New Testament given in Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum*, i. 195 = *Diarium Italicum*, p. 212, and in Cotelier, *Patr. apost.*, note on *Const. apost.* vi. 16). Now, seeing that Euthalius also makes use of precisely the same formula of reference (Μωϋσίου ἀποκρύφου) as in the case of verse 9 of the Epistle of Jude (Zaccagni, p. 485), we may perhaps venture to assume that he had before him a Christian version of the *Assumptio Mosis*, in which Gal. vi. 15 had been inserted. Syncellus and the author of the anonymous list just referred to have clearly drawn upon Euthalius. *Gnostic Books of Moses* are mentioned as being in use among the Sethites by Epiphanius. *Haer.* xxxix. 5. For *Apocrypha Mosis* generally, see *Const. apost.* vi. 16. Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 825–849, ii. 111–130. Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis*, pp. 232–235. Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen" in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 352 sqq. (Nos. 4, 18, 26, 29, 35).

Use of the *Assumptio Mosis* in the Christian Church: Epistle of Jude, ver. 9. Clement of Alexandria, *Adumbrat. in epist. Judae* (in Zahn's *Supplementum Clementinum*, 1884, p. 84): Hic confirmat assumptionem Moysi. Other legends in Clement of Alexandria regarding the death and ascension of Moses, have in all probability been borrowed no less from our writing (*Strom.* i. 28. 158, vi. 15. 182. Comp. Zahn, p. 96 sq.). Origen, *De principiis*, iii. 2. 1: Et primo quidem in Genesi serpens Evam seduxisse describitur, de quo in Ascensione Moysi, cujus libelli meminit in epistola sua apostolus Judas, Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Moysi ait a diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam exstisse praevaricationis Adae et Evae. Idem, *In Josuam homil.* ii. 1 (ed. Lommatsch, xi. 22): Denique et in libello quodam, licet in canone non habeatur, mysterii tamen

hujus figura describitur. Refertur enim, quia duo Moses videbantur: unus vivus in spiritu, alius mortuus in corpore. Didymus Alex., *In epist. Judae enarratio* (in Gallandi, *Biblioth. Patr.* vi. 307), finds in Jude, ver. 9, evidence in favour of the view that even the devil is not evil by nature or *substantialiter*, and alleges that the adversarii hujus contemplationis praescribunt praesenti epistolae et Moyseos assumptioni propter eum locum ubi significatur verbum Archangeli de corpore Moyseos ad diabolum factum. *Acta Synodi Nicaen.* ii. 20 (in Fabricius, i. 844): 'Εν βιβλίῳ δὲ Ἀναλήψεως Μωυσίου Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος διαλεγόμενος τῷ διαβόλῳ λέγει κ.τ.λ. For another passage from these same Acts, see p. 74 above. Evodii epist. ad Augustin. (*Augustin. epist.* cclix. in Fabricius, i. 845 sq.): Quamquam et in apocryphis et in secretis ipsius Moysei, quae scriptura caret auctoritate, tunc cum ascenderet in montem ut moreretur vi corporis, efficitur ut aliud esset quod terrae mandaretur, aliud quod angelo comitanti sociaretur. Sed non satis urget me apocryphorum praeferre sententiam illis superioribus rebus definitis. For additional passages, and chiefly from Greek scholia, see Rönach, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1869, pp. 216–220. Hilgenfeld, *Clementis Romani epist.* 2nd ed. pp. 127–129. In the lists of the apocryphal books we find a *Διαθήκη Μωυσίου* and an *Ἀνάληψις Μωυσίου* (the one immediately after the other in the stichometry of Nicephorus, and in the “Synopsis Athanasii” as given in Credner’s *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, pp. 121, 145; as also in the anonymous list edited by Pitra and others, see v. 7 below). Now, seeing that the writing that has come down to us is in point of fact a “Testament (will) of Moses,” though, as we have already seen, it is quoted in the Acts of the Council of Nicaea under the title *Ἀνάληψις Μωυσίου*, it may be assumed that both these designations were the titles of two separate divisions of one and the same work, the first of which has been preserved, whereas the quotations in the Fathers almost all belong to the second.

Editions of the Latin text: Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et prof.* vol. i. fasc. i. (Milan 1861), pp. 55–64. Hilgenfeld, *Clementis Romani epistolae* (likewise under the title *Novum Testam. extra canonem receptum*, fasc. i.), 1st ed. 1866, pp. 98–115, 2nd ed. 1876, pp. 107–135. Volkmar, *Mose Prophetie und Himmelfahrt, eine Quelle für das Neue Testament, zum erstenmale deutsch herausgegeben im Zusammenhang der Apokrypha und der Christologie überhaupt*, Leipzig 1867. Schmidt (Moriz) and Merz, “Die Assumptio Moisi mit Einleitung und erklärenden Anmerkungen herausgegeben” (Merz’ *Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T.’s*, vol. i. Part ii. 1868, pp. 111–152). Fritzsche, *Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece* (Lips. 1871), pp. 700–730; comp. *Prolegom.* pp. 32–36. A rendering back into the Greek was attempted by Hilgenfeld, for which see *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1868, pp. 273–309, 356, and his *Messias Judaeorum*, 1869, pp. 435–468; comp. *Prolegom.* pp. 70–76.

For contributions toward the criticism and exposition of our book, see, besides the editions just mentioned, Ewald, *Göttinger gelehrte Anz.* 1862, St. 1. Idem, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. v. (3rd ed. 1867), pp. 73–82. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 102–111. Idem, in Reusch’s *Theolog. Literaturbl.* 1871, No. 3. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für*

wissensch. Theol. 1867, pp. 217-223. *Ibid.* Haupt, p. 448. Rönach, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* vol. xi. 1868, pp. 76-108, 466-468; xii. 1869, pp. 213-228; xiv. 1871, pp. 89-92; xvii. 1874, pp. 542-562; xxviii. 1885, pp. 102-104. Philippi, *Das Buch Henoch* (1868), pp. 166-191. Colani, "L'Assomption de Moïse" (*Revue de Théologie*, 1868, 2nd part). Carrière, *Note sur le Taxo de l'Assomption de Moïse* (*ibid.* 1868, 2nd part). Wieseler, "Die jüngst aufgefundenene Aufnahme Moses nach Ursprung und Inhalt untersucht" (*Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1868, pp. 622-648). Idem, "Oseei und Taxo" (*Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* 1882, p. 193 sq.). Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, 1868, pp. 41-47. Heidenheim, "Beiträge zum bessern Verständniss der *Ascensio Mosis*" (*Vierteljahrschr. für deutsch. und Englisch-theol. Forschung und Kritik*, vol. iv. (Part I. 1869). Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. iv. pp. 76-80 (1st ed. iii. 278-282). Stähelin, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1874, pp. 216-218. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (1877), pp. 74-84. Lucius, *Der Essenismus* (1881), pp. 111-119, 127 sq. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, §572. Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen" in *Herzog's Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 352 sq. Deane, "The Assumption of Moses" (*Monthly Interpreter*, March 1885, pp. 321-348).

4. *The Apocalypse of Baruch.*

The large Peshito manuscript of Milan (*Cod. Ambros. B. 21, inf.*) also contains a *Revelation of Baruch*, regarding which we have no further information of a trustworthy kind. Only a small fraction of it, viz. the epistle addressed to the nine and a half tribes in the captivity, inserted at the close (chaps. lxxviii.-lxxxvi.), has been otherwise transmitted to us and already printed in the Paris and London Polyglots. But beyond this there is hardly any other trace of it to be met with (see below). The book was first introduced to public notice through a Latin version prepared and edited by Ceriani (1866). This scholar subsequently published the Syrian text itself (in ordinary type in 1871, and in a photolithographed fac-simile in 1883). Fritzsche, after making a few emendations upon it, embodied Ceriani's Latin version in his edition of the Apocrypha (1871). The book purports to be a writing composed by Baruch in which he recounts (using the first person throughout) what happened to him immediately before and after the destruction of Jerusalem, and what revelations were made to him. The contents are substantially as follows:—*First section*, chaps. i.-v.: In the five

and twentieth year of the reign of Jeconiah [a complete confounding of dates by which the author means to indicate the time of the destruction of Jerusalem] God intimates to Baruch the impending ruin of Jerusalem and the kingdom of Judah. Chaps. vi.-viii.: On the following day the Chaldean army appears before the walls of the city. However it is not the Chaldeans but four angels that destroy it. No sooner is this done than the Chaldeans enter the city and carry away its inhabitants into captivity. Chaps. ix.-xii.: While Jeremiah accompanies these latter, Baruch, in obedience to the command of God, remains behind among the ruins. *Second section*, chaps. xiii.-xv.: After he had fasted seven days, God informs him that one day judgment would overtake the Gentiles as well and that in his own time; and He calms his apprehensions generally about the prosperity of the ungodly and the calamities of the righteous. Chaps. xvi.-xx.: Baruch brings forward yet further grounds of perplexity, but God discourages his doing so, and ultimately orders him to prepare, by another seven days' fasting, for receiving a revelation of the order of the times. *Third section*, xxi.-xxvi.: After fasting and praying to God, he is first of all censured by God for his doubts and pusillanimity, and then, in answer to his question as to when the judgment of the ungodly would take place and how long it would last, God communicates to him the following (chaps. xxvii.-xxviii.): The time of the tribulation will be divided into twelve parts, and each part will bring with it its own special disaster. But the measure of that time will be two parts, weeks of seven weeks (*duae partes hebdomades septem hebdomadarum*). Chaps. xxviii.-xxx.: To the further question of Baruch whether the tribulation would be confined to only *one* part of the earth or extend to the whole of it, God answers that it will of course affect the whole earth. But after that the Messiah will appear and times of joy and glory begin to dawn. Chaps. xxxi.-xxxiv.: After receiving those revelations Baruch summons a meeting of the elders of the people in the valley of Kidron, when he announces to them

that: post modicum tempus concutietur aedificatio Sion, ut aedificetur iterum. Verum non permanebit ipsa illa aedificatio, sed iterum post tempus eradicabitur, et permanebit desolata usque ad tempus. Et postea oportet renovari in gloria, et coronabitur in perpetuum. *Fourth section*, chaps. xxxv.-xxxviii: Hereupon, Baruch, as he sits lamenting upon the ruins of the Holy of holies, falls asleep and in a dream is favoured with a new revelation. He sees a large forest surrounded by mountains and rocks. Over against it grew a vine, and from under the vine flowed a spring which developed into large streams that made channels for themselves underneath the forest and the mountains till these latter fell in and were swept away. Only a single cedar was left, but at last it too was uprooted. Thereupon the vine and the spring came and ordered the cedar to betake itself to where the rest of the forest had already gone. And the cedar was burnt up, but the vine continued to grow and everything around it flourished. Chaps. xxxviii.-xl: In answer to Baruch's request God interprets the dream to him as follows: Behold the kingdom that destroys Zion will itself be overthrown and subjugated by another that will succeed it. And this in its turn will be overthrown and a third will arise. And then this also will be swept away and a fourth will arise, more terrible than all that have preceded it. And when the time for its overthrow has come then Mine Anointed will appear, who is like a spring and a vine, and He will annihilate the armies of that kingdom. And that cedar means the last remaining general (*dux*, prince?) in it who will be condemned and put to death by Mine Anointed. And the reign of Mine Anointed will endure for ever. Chaps. xli.-xliii: Baruch receives a commission to exhort the people and at the same time to prepare himself, by renewed fasting, for fresh revelations. Chaps. xliv.-xlvi: Baruch exhorts the elders of the people. *Fifth section*, chaps. xlvii.-xlviii. 24: He fasts seven days and prays to God. Chap. xlviii. 25-50: The new revelations have reference, in the first instance, to the tribulations of the last

time generally. Chaps. xlix.-lii.: When, upon this, Baruch expresses a desire to learn something more about the nature of the new resurrection bodies of the righteous his wish is complied with; not only so, but he is enlightened with regard to the future blessedness of the righteous and the misery of the ungodly generally. *Sixth section*, chap. liii.: In a new vision Baruch sees a huge cloud rising from the sea and covering the whole earth and discharging first black water and then clear, then black again and then clear, and so on twelve times in succession. At last there came black waters and after them bright lightning, which latter brought healing to the whole earth, and ultimately there came twelve streams and subjected themselves to this lightning. Chaps. liv.-lv.: In answer to his prayer Baruch receives through the angel Ramiel the following interpretation of the vision: Chaps. lvi.-lvii.: The huge cloud means the present world. The *first*, the *dark* water means the sin of Adam, whereby he brought death and ruin into the world. The *second*, the *clear* water means Abraham and his descendants, who, although not in possession of the written law, nevertheless complied with its requirements. The *third*, the *dark* water represents the subsequent generations of sinful humanity, particularly the Egyptians. The *fourth*, the *clear* water means the appearing of Moses, Aaron, Joshua, and Caleb, and the giving of the law, and God's revelations to Moses. The *fifth*, the *dark* water represents the works of the Amorites and the magicians, in which Israel also participated. The *sixth*, the *clear* water represents the time of David and Solomon. The *seventh*, the *dark* water means the revolt of Jeroboam and the sins of his successors and the overthrow of the kingdom of the ten tribes. The *eighth*, the *clear* water means the integrity of Hezekiah and his deliverance from Sennacherib. The *ninth*, the *dark* water means the universal ungodliness in the days of Manasseh and the announcing of the destruction of Jerusalem. The *tenth*, the *clear* water denotes the reign of the good king Josiah. The *eleventh*, the *dark* water represents the present tribulation

(i.e. in Baruch's own time), the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Babylonian captivity. Chap. lxviii.: But the *twelfth*, the *clear* water means that the people of Israel will again experience times of joy, that Jerusalem will be rebuilt, that the offering of sacrifices will be resumed, and that the priests will return to their duties. Chaps. lxix.-lxxi.: But the *last dark* water which is yet to come, and which proves worse than all that went before, means this: that tribulation and confusion will come upon the whole earth. A few will rule over the many, the poor will become rich and the rich will become poor, knaves will be exalted above heroes, wise men will keep silence and fools will speak. And in obedience to God's command the nations which He has prepared for the purpose will come and war with such of the leaders as are still left (*cum ducibus, qui reliqui fuerint tunc*). And it will come to pass that he who escapes from the war will perish by the earthquake, and he who escapes from the earthquake will perish by fire, and he who escapes the fire will perish with hunger. And he who escapes the whole of those evils will be given into the hands of Mine Anointed. Chaps. lxxii.-lxxiv.: But this dreadful dark water will at length be followed by yet more *clear water*. This means that the time of Mine Anointed will come and that He will judge the nations and sit for ever upon the throne of His kingdom. And all tribulation will come to an end, and peace and joy will reign upon the earth. Chaps. lxxv.-lxxvi.: Baruch thanks God for the revelation with which he had been favoured, and then God directs him to wait for forty days and then go to the top of a certain mountain where all the different regions of the earth would pass before his view. After this he is to be removed from the world. *Seventh section*, chap. lxxvii.: Baruch delivers a hortatory address to the people, and at the request of the latter he, on the 21st day of the eighth month, also composes two hortatory addresses to be sent to their brethren in the captivity, one to the nine and a half tribes and the other to the remaining two and a half. Chaps. lxxviii.-lxxxvi.:

The import of the first of the two addresses is as follows: Baruch in the first place reminds his readers that the judgment of God which has overtaken them is a just judgment, he then tells them of the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar and the carrying away of the inhabitants into captivity, and intimates to them the judgment of God that is awaiting their oppressors and then their own ultimate deliverance. In conclusion, he founds upon this an exhortation to continue steadfast in their devotion to God and His law. Chap. lxxvii.: He sends this epistle to the nine and a half tribes in captivity through the medium of an eagle.

At this point the book, as we now possess it, breaks off. But originally it must have contained somewhat more, for from lxxvii. 19 there is reason to infer that the epistle addressed to the nine and a half tribes was followed by a similar one addressed to the other two and a half tribes. And from chap. lxxvi. it is to be presumed that the book would proceed to tell how Baruch was shown all the countries of the world from the top of a mountain and was thereafter taken away from the earth.

As regards the date of the composition of our apocalypse this much at least may be affirmed with certainty, that it was not written till after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. For in chap. xxxii. 2-4, Baruch announces to the assembled people that (after its first destruction by Nebuchadnezzar) Jerusalem is to be rebuilt again. *But that this building will not continue to stand, but that it will in like manner be destroyed again.* And then the city will lie waste for a long period, until the glorious time when it will be rebuilt and crowned for ever. But, with the exception of this passage, there is not another that throws any light upon the date of the composition of our book. For nothing bearing upon this is to be gathered from the obscure passage in which we are informed that the time of tribulation is to last "two parts, weeks of seven weeks" (xxviii. 2: *duae partes hebdomades septem hebdomadarum*), for the meaning of these words is as uncer-

tain as it is obscure. Consequently the calculations which Ewald, Hilgenfeld, Wieseler, and Dillmann above all have tried to found upon this passage have no certain basis on which to rest. Possibly one would be much more likely to find some clue to the date in question in *the affinity which this work bears to the Fourth Book of Ezra*. For the points of contact between both those books in regard to thought and expression alike are (as Langen has pointed out, pp. 6–8) so numerous that we must of necessity assume either that they were written by one and the same author, or that the one borrowed from the other. It is now almost universally believed that it may be proved with a greater or less degree of certainty that our book has drawn upon the Fourth Book of Ezra (so Ewald, Langen, Hilgenfeld, Hausrath, Stähelin, Renan, Drummond, Dillmann). It appears to me however that as yet no decisive arguments have been advanced in support of this view. In the case of Langen, who was the first to go thoroughly into this question, and who has done much to influence subsequent opinion on the matter, his main argument was that the Book of Baruch corrected, as he supposed, the somewhat crude notions of Ezra respecting the doctrine of original sin. In order that the reader may be in a more favourable position for estimating the value of this argument, we will here subjoin in parallel columns what each of the two books says on this point:—

EZRA :

iii. 7 : Et huic (Adamo) mandasti diligere viam tuam, et praeteriviteam; et statim instituisti in eum mortem et in nationibus ejus.

iii. 21–22 : Cor enim malignum bajulans primus, Adam transgressus et victus est; sed et omnes, qui de eo nati sunt. Et facta est permanens infirmitas.

iv. 30 : Quoniam granum seminis mali seminatum est in corde Adam ab initio, et quantum impietatis generavit usque nunc, et generat usque dum veniat areal

BARUCH :

xvii. 3 : (Adam) mortem attulit et abecidit annos eorum, qui ab eo geniti fuerunt.

xxiii. 4 : Quando peccavit Adam et decreta fuit mors contra eos, qui gignerentur, etc.

xlvi. 42 : O quid fecisti Adam omnibus, qui a te geniti sunt!

liv. 15, 19 : Si enim Adam prior peccavit, et attulit mortem super omnes immaturam; sed etiam illi qui ex eo nati sunt, unusquisque ex eis praeeparavit animae suae tormentum futurum : et iterum unusquisque ex

vii. 48: O tu quid fecisti Adam?	eis elegit sibi gloriam futuram . . .
Si enim tu peccasti, non est factus	Non est ergo Adam causa, nisi animae
solius tuus casus, sed et nostrum, qui	suae tantum; nos vero unusquisque
ex te advenimus.	fuit animae suae Adam.

Now Langen supposes that the last of the passages quoted from Baruch (liv. 19: Non est ergo Adam causa, nisi animae suae tantum; nos vero unusquisque fuit animae suae Adam) is above all intended to modify the somewhat harsh view of Ezra. But one can easily see that the utterances of Baruch on other occasions are quite as blunt as those of Ezra. And, on the other hand, there are passages to be met with in Ezra in which the author emphasizes quite as strongly as Baruch liv. 19, though in different terms, the thought that every man is to blame for his own ruin. To take only a single example, compare viii. 55-61. Here then we have not even an actual difference of view, far less a correction of the one writer on the part of the other. Further, such other reasons as have been advanced in favour of the priority of Ezra and the dependent character of Baruch are merely considerations of an extremely general kind which may be met with, considerations equally well calculated to prove quite the reverse. Some are inclined to think that in the case of the author of the Fourth Book of Ezra "there is more of a despairing frame of mind, that his striving after light and his desire to have his apprehensions quieted are deeper, more urgent, and of a more overmastering character, that, because the impressions produced by the dreadful events are rather fresher in his mind, his narrative is also, for this very reason and in spite of its verbosity, the more impressive of the two, and so on" (so Dillmann). My own opinion is that it is quite the converse of this, and that it would be nearer the truth to say that it is precisely in the case of Baruch that this problem is uppermost, viz. How is the calamity of Israel and the impunity of its oppressors possible and conceivable? while in the case of Ezra, though this problem concerns him too, still there is a question that almost lies yet nearer his heart, viz.

Why is it that so many perish and so few are saved? The subordination of the former of these questions to the other, which is a purely theological one, appears to me rather to indicate that Ezra is of a later date than Baruch. Not only so, but it is decidedly of a more finished character, and is distinguished by greater maturity of thought and a greater degree of lucidity than the last-mentioned book. But this is a point in regard to which it is scarcely possible to arrive at a definite conclusion. And hence we are equally unable to say whether our book was written shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem (so Hilgenfeld, Fritzsche, Drummond), or during the reign of Domitian (so Ewald), or in the time of Trajan (so Langen, Wieseler, Renan, Dillmann). Undoubtedly the most probable supposition of all is that it was composed not long after the destruction of the holy city, when the question "How could God permit such a disaster?" was still a burning one. It is older at all events than the time of *Papias*, whose chimerical fancies about the millennial kingdom (Irenaeus, v. 33. 3) are borrowed from our Apocalypse (xxix. 5).²⁴ The existing Syrian text has been taken from the Greek (see Langen, p. 8 sq.; Kneucker, p. 192 sq.; Dillmann, p. 358).

With the exception of the passage in *Papias* just mentioned, no certain trace of the use of our book in the Christian Church is anywhere to be met with. There is every reason to believe that it had been pushed into the background by the kindred Ezra-apocalypse. Still the fact of its finding a place in the *Peshito manuscript* of Milan serves to show that it was still in use at a later period at least in the Syrian Church. In the lists of the apocrypha given in the *Stichometry* of Nicephorus and the "*Synopsis Athanasii*" (in Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, pp. 121, 146) there are added at the close: Βαροχ, Ἀββακὺμ, Ἐζκιηλ καὶ Δανιηλ ψευδεπίγραφα. But it is

²⁴ In his edition of Irenaeus (ii. 417), Harvey attempts to show that the text of *Papias* presupposes a *Syrian original* on which it is based, for he thinks that a certain anomaly occurring in his text may be most easily accounted for by the hypothesis of such an original. If this were correct, it would be of considerable interest as regards the matter now in hand. The anomaly in question admits however of being otherwise explained. See Gebhardt and Harnack's edition of the *Epistle of Barnabas* (2nd ed. 1878), p. 87.

extremely uncertain whether, by the first-mentioned book, it is our apocalypse that is meant, for besides the Baruch of the Greek Bible, and which in the lists just referred to is included among the canonical books, there were also other apocryphal writings bearing this name. (1) There are considerable fragments of a *gnostic* Book of Baruch given in the *Philosophumena* v. 26–27 (comp. v. 24). (2) A *Christian* Book of Baruch, which is akin to our apocalypse and has borrowed largely from it, has been published in Ethiopic by Dillmann under the title “*Reliqua verborum Baruchi*” (in Dillmann’s *Chrestomathia aethiopica*, Lips. 1866), as it had been previously in Greek in a Greek *Menaeus* (Venetiis 1609), and recently again by Ceriani under the title “*Paralipomena Jeremiae*” (*Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. v. 1, Mediol. 1868), and finally in a German version by Prätorius (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1872, pp. 280–247), and by König (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1877, pp. 318–338). On this book comp. also Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vii. 183. Fritzsche, *Libri apocr. prolegom.* p. 32. Sachse, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1874, p. 268 sq. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch*, p. 196 sq. Dillmann in Herzog’s *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 358 sq. (3) In the *Allocutio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani*, lately published by Harnack, there occurs the following passage from a Book of Baruch (Gebhardt and Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. i. part 3, 1883, p. 25): *Prope finem libri sui de nativitate ejus [scil. Christi] et de habitu vestis et de passione ejus et de resurrectione ejus prophetavit dicens: Hic unctus meus, electus meus, vulvae incontaminatae jaculatus, natus et passus dicitur.* Judging from the Christology implied in this passage, the Baruch here in question can only have been composed at the soonest in the fourth century of our era (see Harnack, p. 46). Further, in Cyprian’s *Testim.* iii. 29, we find that in one manuscript there has been inserted a quotation from some Book of Baruch or other, which quotation, however, we have no means of verifying. (4) Tichonrawow contemplates editing an Apocalypse of Baruch in the old Slavonic version (see *Theol. Literaturztg.* 1877, p. 658). Whether it has as yet appeared, and what its relation to other Books of Baruch with which we are already acquainted, I am unable to say.

The epistle to the nine and a half tribes in the captivity, which forms the conclusion of our apocalypse, has been already printed in the Paris Polyglot, vol. ix., in the London Polyglot, vol. iv., in Lagarde’s edition of the Syrian version of the apocrypha (*Libri Vet. Test. apocryphi syriace*, ed. de Lagarde, Lips. 1861), also in Latin in Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* ii. 145–155. Also in an English and French version; see Fritzsche’s *Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, i. 175 sq., and *Libri Apocr.* p. xxxi. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch*, p. 190 sq.

Ceriani’s Latin version of our apocalypse appeared in the *Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. i. fasc. 2 (Mediol. 1866), pp. 78–98. For this see also Fritzsche, *Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece* (Lips. 1871), pp. 654–699. The Syrian text was edited by Ceriani in the *Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. v. fasc. 2 (Mediol. 1871), pp. 113–180. This latter was also included in the photo-lithographed fac-simile of the whole manuscript, published under the title *Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice*

Ambrosiano sec. fere VI. photolithographice edita curante et adnotante Antonio Maria Ceriani, 2 vols. in 4 parts, Milan 1876-1883 (the Apocalypse of Baruch being in the last part). *Comp. Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1876, p. 329; 1878, p. 228; 1881, col. 4; 1884, col. 27.

Critical inquiries: Langen, *De apocalypsi Baruch anno superiori primum edita commentatio*, Friburgi in Brisgovia, 1867 (xxiv. p. 4). Ewald, *Göttinger gel. Anzeigen*, 1867, p. 1706 sqq. Idem, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vii. 83-87. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1869, pp. 437-440. Idem, *Messias Judaeorum*, p. lxiii. sq. Wieseler, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1870, p. 288 (in his article on the Fourth Book of Ezra). Fritzsche, *Libri apocr. Prolegom.* pp. 30-32. Hausath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. iv. 88 sq. (1st ed. iii. 290). Stähelin, *Jahrb. für deutsche Theol.* 1874, p. 211 sqq. Renan, "L'Apocalypse de Baruch" (*Journal des Savants*, April 1877, pp. 222-231). Idem, *Les évangiles*, 1877, pp. 517-530. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, 1877, pp. 117-132. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch*, 1879, pp. 190-198. Kaulen in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlex.* 2nd ed. i. 1058 sq. (art. "Apokryphen-Literatur"). Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 356-358 (art. "Pseudepigraphen"). Deane, "The Apocalypse of Baruch," i. (*Monthly Interpreter*, April 1885, pp. 451-461).

5. *The Fourth Book of Ezra.*

Of all the Jewish apocalypses none has been so widely circulated in the early Church and in the Church of the Middle Ages as the so-called Fourth Book of Ezra. By Greek and Latin Fathers it is used as a genuine prophetic work (see below). The fact of there being Syrian, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Armenian versions of the book is evidence of the extent to which it was circulated in the East. Then the circumstance that a Latin version has come down to us in a large number of Bible manuscripts is calculated to show the favour with which, in like manner, it was still regarded by the Church of Rome in the Middle Ages. It was for this reason no doubt that it was also added as an appendix to the authorized Roman Vulgate. Not only so, it even found its way into German versions of the Protestant Bible (see more below). The whole of the five versions which we possess are taken, some of them directly, others indirectly, from a Greek text (now no longer extant), which, moreover, is to be regarded as the original one.

The text of the Latin Vulgate consists of sixteen chapters. But, as is generally admitted, the two first and the two last of

these, which do not appear in the Oriental versions, are later additions by a Christian hand. Accordingly in its original form the book would only embrace the portion between chaps. iii. and xiv. inclusive. The contents of the original work are divided into *seven visions*, with which, as he himself informs us, Ezra had been favoured. *First vision* (iii. 1-v. 20): In the thirtieth year after the destruction of the city (Jerusalem) Ezra is in Babylon, and in his prayer to God he complains of the calamities of Israel on the one hand, and of the prosperity of the Gentile nations on the other (iii. 1-36). The angel Uriel comes, and, in the first place, reproves him for his complaints (iv. 1-21), and then proceeds to remind him that wickedness has its appointed time (iv. 22-32), just as the dead have an appointed time during which they require to stay in the nether world (iv. 33-43). But the most of the distress is already past, and its end will be announced by means of definite signs (iv. 44-v. 13). Ezra is so exhausted by the revelation that has been imparted to him that he requires to be strengthened by the angel. By fasting for seven days he prepares himself for a new revelation (v. 14-20). *Second vision* (v. 21-vi. 34): Ezra renews his complaints, and is once more rebuked by the angel (v. 21-40). This latter points out to him that in the history of mankind one thing must come after another, and that the beginning and the end cannot come at one and the same time. Ezra is reminded, however, that he may nevertheless see that the end is already approaching. It will be brought about by God Himself, the Creator of the world (v. 41-vi. 6). The signs of the end are more fully enumerated than in the previous vision (vi. 7-29). Uriel here takes leave of Ezra, with the promise of further revelations (vi. 30-34). *Third vision* (vi. 35-ix. 25): Ezra complains again, and is again rebuked by the angel (vi. 35-vii. 25). Upon this he is favoured with the following revelation:—Whenever the signs (enumerated in the preceding visions) begin to appear, then those delivered from the calamities in question will see won-

derful things: For my Son, the Anointed One, will appear with His retinue, and He will diffuse joy among those that are spared, and that for four hundred years. And at the expiry of those years, my Son, the Anointed One, will die, He and all who have the breath of life. For the space of seven days, corresponding to the seven creative days, there will not be a single human being upon the earth. Then the dead will rise; and the Most High will come and sit upon the judgment-seat, and proceed with the judgment (vii. 26-35).²⁵ And the place of torment will be revealed, and over against it the place of rest. And the length of the day of judgment will be a year-week (vi. 1-17 = Bensly, vv. 36-44). Only a few men will be saved. The majority will be consigned to perdition (vi. 18-48 = Bensly, vv. 45-74). Moreover, the ungodly do not enter at death into habitations of rest, but when they die are at once consigned to sevenfold torment, of which this also forms a part, that they find it no longer possible to repent, and that they foresee their future condemnation. But the righteous, on the other hand, enter into rest, and experience sevenfold joy, of which, among other things, this forms a part, that they foresee their ultimate blessedness (vi. 49-76 = Bensly, 75-101). But on the day of judgment each receives what he has deserved; and no one, by interceding for him, can alter the fate of another (vi. 77-83 = Bensly, 102-105).²⁶ Ezra's objection, that surely the Scriptures speak of the righteous having often interceded in behalf of the ungodly, is dismissed with the remark on the part of the angel, that what might avail for this world will not do so for eternity

²⁵ What follows (vi. 1-83) is not found in the majority of the manuscripts of the Latin version, and can only have been borrowed at some former period from the Oriental manuscripts and inserted here. Fritzsche gives the fragment according to the Syriac version, though retaining the numbering of the chapters and verses usually followed in the Ethiopic one. Since 1875 and 1877 we have been made acquainted with the Latin text through two manuscripts (see below). I give above both the numbering of the verses adopted by Fritzsche and that followed by Bensly in his edition of the Latin text.

²⁶ At this point the Latin Vulgate text comes in again.

as well (vii. 36-45). When Ezra is deploring that the whole ruin of the human race has been brought about by Adam, the angel refers him to the impiety of men through which they have become the authors of their own ruin (vii. 46-69). Then follow further explanations, having reference to the circumstance that of the many that are created so very few are saved (viii. 1-62). Finally, the signs of the last time are unfolded to Ezra anew (viii. 63-ix. 13), and his anxiety at the thought of so many being lost is once more set at rest (ix. 14-25). *Fourth vision* (ix. 26-x. 60): While Ezra is again indulging his complaints, he sees a woman on his right hand weeping, and who, in answer to his questions, tells him that after thirty years of barrenness she gave birth to a son, brought him up with great difficulty, and then procured a wife for him, but that just as he was entering the bride-chamber he fell and was killed (ix. 26-x. 4). Ezra chides her for bewailing the mere loss of a son, when she ought rather to be weeping over the destruction of Jerusalem and the ruin of so many men (x. 5-24). Then all at once her face is lifted up, she utters a cry, the earth quakes, and instead of the woman there appears a strongly built city. At this sight Ezra is so perplexed that he cries to the angel Uriel, who at once appears and gives him the following explanation of what he had just seen: The woman is Zion. The thirty years of barrenness are the 3000 years during which no sacrifices had as yet been offered on Zion. The birth of the son represents the building of the temple by Solomon, and the instituting of sacrificial worship on Zion. The death of the son refers to the destruction of Jerusalem. But the newly built city was shown to Ezra in the vision with the view of comforting him, and of saving him from despair (x. 25-60). *Fifth vision* (xi. 1-xii. 51): In a dream Ezra sees an eagle rise out of the sea, having *twelve wings* and *three heads*. And out of the wings grew *eight subordinate wings*, which became small and feeble winglets. But the heads were resting, and the centre one was larger than the others. And the eagle flew and

ruled over the land. And from within its body there issued a voice which ordered the wings to rule one after another. And the twelve wings ruled, one after the other (the second more than twice as long as any of the others, xi. 17), and then vanished, and similarly two of the winglets, so that at last only the three heads and the six winglets were left. Two of those winglets separated themselves from the rest, and placed themselves under the head on the right-hand side. The other four wanted to rule, but two of them soon vanished and the two were consumed by the heads. And the middle head ruled over the whole earth and then vanished. And the two other heads also ruled. But the one on the right-hand side devoured the one on the left (xi. 1-35). Then Ezra sees a lion, and hears how, with a human voice, it describes the eagle just referred to as being the fourth of those animals to which God has in succession committed the empire of the world. And the lion announces to the eagle its impending destruction (xi. 36-46). Thereupon the only remaining head also vanished. And the two winglets which had joined themselves to it began to rule.²⁷ But their rule was of a feeble character. And the whole body of the eagle was consumed with fire (xii. 1-3). The meaning of the vision which Ezra rehearses is as follows. The eagle represents the last of Daniel's kingdoms. The twelve wings are twelve kings who are to rule over it, one after another. The second will begin to reign, and will reign longer than the others. The voice which issues from the body of the eagle means that in the course of the duration of that kingdom (*inter tempus regni illius*, as we ought to read with the Syriac and the other Oriental versions) evil disorders will arise; and it will be involved in great trouble, only it will not fall, but regain its power. But the eight subordinate wings represent eight kings, whose respective times will be of short duration. Two of these will

²⁷ Here the correct text is that presented by the Oriental versions. See Hilgenfeld and Fritzsche (in answer to Volkmar, who adheres to the corrupt L.A. of the Latin version).

perish when the intermediate time approaches (*appropinquante tempore medio*, i.e. that interregnum to which reference had just been made). Four of them will be reserved for the time when the end is approaching, and two for the time of the end itself. But the meaning of the three heads is as follows. At the time of the end the Most High will raise up three kings,²⁸ who will rule over the earth. And they will cause impiety to reach a climax, and will bring about the end. The one (=the middle head) will die in his bed, but in the midst of torment. Of the remaining two one will be cut off by the sword of the other, while the latter will himself fall by the sword at the time of the end. Finally, the two subordinate wings, which joined the head on the right, represent the two remaining kings of the closing period, whose reign will be feeble and full of disorder (xii. 4-30). But the lion which announces to the eagle its impending destruction represents the Messiah, whom the Most High has reserved for the end. He will arraign them (the kings?) while yet alive before His tribunal, and convict them of their wickedness, and then destroy them. But the people of God He will cause to rejoice (during 400 years, as was foretold in the third vision) till the day of judgment comes (xii. 31-34). After receiving those revelations Ezra is commissioned to write what he had seen in a book, and preserve it in a secret place (xii. 35-51).—*Sixth vision* (xiii. 1-58): Once more he sees in a dream a man rising up out of the sea. And an innumerable company of men gathered themselves together for the purpose of warring against that man. And when they marched out against him, he emitted a fiery breath and flames from his mouth, so that they were all burnt up. Thereupon other men advanced toward him, some of them joyfully, others in sadness, and some again in fetters (xiii. 1-13). In answer to Ezra's request this vision is explained to him as follows. The man who rises out of the sea is he by whom God will redeem His whole creation. He will annihilate his enemies, not with the spear

²⁸ So the Oriental versions. The Latin has *tria regna*.

or implements of war, but by means of the law, which is like unto fire. But the peaceful crowd that advances towards him is the ten tribes returning from the captivity (xiii. 14-58).—*Seventh vision* (xiv. 1-50): Ezra is commissioned by God to instruct the people and set his house in order and withdraw from mortal things, for he is about to be taken from the earth. Moreover, he is to take to himself five men who, during a period of forty days, are to write down what they are told to write. And Ezra did so. And the men wrote what they did not understand. Thereupon Ezra was carried away and conveyed to the place appointed for such as he (xiv. 1-50).

For anything at all decisive with regard to the *date of the composition* of this remarkable book, we are chiefly indebted to the interpretation of the vision of the eagle. For the data furnished by the other passages that have been brought to bear upon this point are of too uncertain a character to be of much service. For example in chap. vi. 9 it is stated that the present world is to end with the rule of Edom, while the world to come is to begin with the supremacy of Israel (*finis enim hujus saeculi Esau, et principium sequentis Jacob*). But it is open to question whether by Edom it is the Herodians (so Hilgenfeld, Volkmar) or whether it is the Romans (so Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. vol. ix. p. 430, 2nd ed. vol. ix. p. 660; Ewald, *Excursus*, p. 198; Langen, p. 125 sq.) that are meant. The latter is no doubt the correct view of the matter.²⁹ But even if the former were to be preferred, very little after all would be gained considering the long period embraced by the Herodian dynasty (down till the year 100 of our era). Then as for the calculation of the

²⁹ In Rabbinical literature Edom is quite a common designation for Rome; see Buxtorf's *Lexicon Chaldaicum*, col. 29 sqq. Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* under "Roma." Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* i. 29. Grünbaum, *Zeitschr. der DMG* xxxi. pp. 305-309. Weber, *System der altsynag. paläst. Theol.* p. 348 and elsewhere. This designation occurs so early as in the *Sifre* (see Weber, p. 60). Comp. further Jerome's *Comment. ad Jesaj.* xxi. 11, 12 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, iv. 217): *Quidam Hebraeorum pro Duma Roman legunt, volentes prophetiam contra regnum Romanum dirigi, frivola persuasione qua semper in Idumaeae nomine Romanos existimant demonstrari.*

world-periods as given in chap. xiv. 11, 12 (*Duodecim enim partibus divisum est sæculum, et transierunt ejus decimam et dimidium decimæ partis, superant autem ejus duæ post medium decimæ partis*). The mere fact of the reading fluctuating so much here (in the Syriac and Armenian versions the passage does not occur at all) should of itself have been enough to deter any one from attempting any calculation whatever of these world-periods. It will be seen then that, apart from the general purport of the book, it is the *vision of the eagle* alone that can be said to furnish a clue to the date of its composition. In the interpretation of this vision the *following points*, which naturally present themselves on a general survey of the contents, are *to be kept steadily in view*: the twelve principal wings, the eight subordinate ones, and the three heads represent twenty-three sovereigns or rulers who reign one after the other, and that in the following order. First we have the twelve principal wings and two of the subordinate ones. Then comes a time of disorder. At the expiry of this period four subordinate wings have their turn, and after them the three heads. During the reign of the third head the Messiah appears, upon which follows the overthrow of the third head and the short feeble reign of the two remaining subordinate wings. We thus see that, from the author's standpoint, both the overthrow of the third head and the reign of the last two subordinate wings were still in the future; from which it follows that he must have written during the reign of the third head, and that the reign of the two last subordinate wings is not matter of history, but exists only in the author's imagination. Further, the following points are to be specially noted: (1) The second principal wing reigns more than twice as long as any of the rest (xi. 17). (2) Many of the wings, particularly of the subordinate wings, come upon the scene without actually getting the length of reigning, and therefore represent mere pretenders and usurpers. (3) All the rulers belong to *one and the same* kingdom, and are, or at least aim at being, the rulers of the

whole of that kingdom. (4) The first dies a natural death (xii. 26), the second is murdered by the third (xi. 35, xii. 28). Now, with the help of this exegetical result, let us test the various *interpretations that have been attempted*, and which we may divide into three leading groups, according as the eagle has been supposed to refer either (1) to Rome under the monarchy and the republic, or (2) to the Greek rule, or (3) to Rome under the emperors.

1. Laurence, van der Vlis and Lücke (2nd ed.) understand the vision of the eagle as referring to the history of Rome from the time of Romulus till that of Caesar. Those three writers are all agreed in this, that the three heads represent *Sulla*, *Pompey* and *Caesar*, and that our book was composed in the time of Caesar (Lücke), or shortly after his assassination (van der Vlis), or a little later still (Laurence). No doubt the interpretation 12 + 8 wings is beset with considerable difficulty, but this is supposed to be got over by falling back upon those persons who at a later period aspired to the throne, and upon the party leaders in the time of the civil wars. But even if this were not a somewhat doubtful proceeding, there are still two considerations that could not fail to prove fatal to this view: first, the fact that for a Jewish apocalyptic writer the whole period previous to the time of Pompey would have simply no interest whatever; and then this other fact, that if Rome is to be thought of at all, the reference can only be to a time when she was mistress of the world. For the whole of the wings and heads are intended to represent rulers who exercised or at all events aspired to exercise sway over the entire world.

2. Hilgenfeld supposes the vision to have reference to the Greek rule. It is true that previously (*Apokalyptik*, pp. 217–221) he took the 12 + 8 wings to mean the *Ptolemies*. The twelve wings and the first two of the subordinate wings he made out to be the following:—(1) Alexander the Great, (2) Ptolemy I. Lagi, (3–8) Ptolemy II. to Ptolemy VII., (9) Cleopatra I., (10–14) Ptolemy VIII. Lathyrus to Ptolemy

XII. Auletes. The other six subordinate wings were supposed to refer to the offshoots from the Ptolemaic dynasty down to Cleopatra the younger († 30 B.C.). Then some time after (*Zeitschr.* 1860, pp. 335-358) he substituted the *Seleucidae* for the Ptolemies, and reckoned the kings from Alexander the Great on to the descendants of Seleucus. But still he always adhered strictly to the view, that the three heads were to be taken as referring to *Caesar*, *Antony* and *Octavian*, and that the book must have been composed immediately after Antony's death in the year 30 B.C. (*Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 285: "exactly 30 years before Christ"). Although this interpretation enables us more easily to find room for the twenty kings than the foregoing one, still it can hardly be said to be a bit more tenable. One great objection to it above all is this, that while it supposes the twenty wings to refer to Greek rulers, it regards the three heads, on the other hand, as referring to *Roman* rulers, whereas the text obviously requires us to regard the whole as rulers of one and the same kingdom. But Hilgenfeld's interpretation is incompatible above all with the statement that the second wing was to rule twice as long as any of the others (xi. 17). For this will suit neither the case of Ptolemy I. nor that of Seleucus I. Nicator. Hilgenfeld too has fully realized the awkwardness of this passage, and while at one time he was disposed to look upon it as an interpolation, he has more recently had recourse to the expedient of supposing that, in the statement in question, the author had in view only the first six wings, namely those on the right side, on which assumption he finds that the notice exactly suits the case of Seleucus I. (*Zeitschr.* 1867, p. 286 sq., 1870, p. 310 sq.). But the text does not in the least degree sanction such a limitation as this (*nemo post te tenebit tempus tuum, sed nec dimidium ejus*). There is a further contradiction of the text in the referring of the first head to *Caesar*, who, as is well known, was assassinated, whereas, according to chap. xii. 26, the ruler in question was to die *super lectum*. But let us say generally that every interpretation is to be

regarded as untenable which proceeds on the assumption that the book was written earlier than the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus. One of the principal objects of the book is just this, to comfort the people on the occasion of the destruction in question. Ezra over and over again prays to have an explanation of the mystery of Jerusalem's lying low in the dust while the Gentile nations exult in triumph. It is with regard to this that, through the medium of a divine revelation, he obtains instruction and comfort. Now to write a work of this nature could hardly be supposed to have any meaning or object whatsoever except at a time when Jerusalem was actually lying in ruins. No doubt it is the first destruction of the city (by Nebuchadnezzar) that is in view. But as it is of course impossible that the book can have been written in the decades immediately following this event (if for nothing but chap. xi. 39, xii. 11, where Daniel is presupposed), the only course open to us is to come down to a date subsequent to the destruction by Titus, and to assume that the author intended that first destruction by Nebuchadnezzar to be regarded as, so to speak, a type of the second, and that the consolations purporting to have been communicated to Ezra were in reality meant for that generation in whose minds the recollection of the destruction of the year 70 was still fresh; although for the pseudo-Ezra this event was perhaps more a thing of the past than it was for the pseudo-Baruch. Then a distinct allusion to the destruction of the city by the Romans may also be found in the words which the lion addresses to the eagle (xi. 42): *Destruxisti habitationes eorum qui fructificabant et humiliasti muros eorum qui te non nocuerunt.* Consequently there cannot be a doubt that—

3. Corrodi, Lücke (1st ed.), Gfrörer, Dillmann, Volkmar, Ewald, Langen, Wieseler, Keil, Hausrath, Renan, Drummond, Reuss, Gutschmid, Le Hir are correct in holding that the eagle is to be understood as representing imperial Rome. They are all at one in this, that the line of rulers should begin with *Caesar*, and that, by the second wing, the duration of

whose reign was more than twice as long as that of any of the others (xi. 17), it is *Augustus* that is meant. This point may in fact be regarded as settled. For the placing of *Cæsar* as the first in the line of Roman emperors is also to be met with elsewhere (Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 2. 2, 6. 10 ; *Orac. Sibyll.* v. 10–15. Comp. Volkmar, p. 344). Moreover the length of time during which *Augustus* reigned is estimated, as a rule, at 56 years, counting from his first consulate in the year 711 A.U.C.=43 B.C. (see Volkmar, p. 344 ; Gutschmid, *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 37). According to this calculation the actual duration of the reign of *Augustus* is found to have been more than twice longer than that of all the other Roman emperors belonging to the first three centuries.

But there is one point in regard to which there is an essential difference between Gutschmid and Le Hir on the one hand and all the other writers mentioned above on the other. For while Corrodi (i. 208) and the others understand the three heads as referring to the three Flavian emperors (*Vespasian*, *Titus*, and *Domitian*), and accordingly regard the book as having been written during the last decades of the first century of our era, Gutschmid interprets as follows:—He takes the twelve principal wings to represent: (1) *Caesar*, (2) *Augustus*, (3) *Tiberius*, (4) *Caligula*, (5) *Claudius*, (6) *Nero*, (7) *Vespasian*, (8) *Domitian*, (9) *Trajan*, (10) *Hadrian*, (11) *Antoninus Pius*, (12) *Marcus Aurelius*. The first two of the subordinate wings he supposes to refer to *Titus* and *Nerva*, and the four immediately following them to: (1) *Commodus*, (2) *Pertinax*, (3) *Didius Julianus*, and (4) *Pescennius Niger*. The three heads again he takes to represent, *Septimius Severus* (193–211 A.D.) with his two sons *Caracalla* and *Geta*. *Geta* was murdered by *Caracalla*, but this latter also fell by the sword (217 A.D.). The last two of the subordinate wings he supposes to be intended for *Macrinus* and his son *Diadumenianus*, who were assassinated in the year 218 A.D. He thinks therefore that the vision of the eagle must have been written immediately before, in the month of June 218

(*Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 48). Moreover Gutschmid regards the vision of the eagle as a later interpolation, while he thinks—and here he is more in accord with Hilgenfeld—that the main body of the book must have been written in the year 31 B.C. Le Hir, in *his* interpretation of the vision now in question, coincides with Gutschmid in almost every particular (*Etudes Bibliques*, i. pp. 184–192). The only point in which they differ is this, that Le Hir, founding upon the list of emperors given by Clement of Alexandria, counts the reign of Marcus Aurelius and Commodus as simply one, thus including the latter among those represented by the principal wings, while, to make up for this, he inserts Clodius Albinus after Pescennius Niger among those represented by the subordinate wings. Nor does he think that the entire book was written in the year 218 A.D., but is of opinion that there was in the first instance a Jewish original, and subsequently a Christian revision and modification of this latter. He holds that the former, which is already made use of in the Epistle of Barnabas, was written in the last quarter of the first century of our era, while the Christian revision, in which the vision of the eagle was inserted, would be composed in the year 218 A.D. (*Etudes Bibliques*, i. p. 207 sq.).

The tempting thing about this interpretation is, that it enables us actually to specify all the rulers represented by the 12 + 8 wings, which, if we suppose the Flavian period to be in view, it is impossible to do. But, for all that, it is unquestionably erroneous. It is precluded above all by the circumstance that the book is already quoted by Clement of Alexandria. Consequently it must have been in existence toward the close of the second century. No doubt Gutschmid and Le Hir are disposed to fall back upon the hypothesis of interpolation or of revision and modification. But the book itself furnishes neither occasion nor justification for such a hypothesis. The vision of the eagle fits in admirably, and could scarcely be omitted without completely mutilating the work. The hypothesis of interpolation is therefore gratuitous

length of reigning at all (xi. 25-27). As for the rest they are, quite as much as the principal wings, rulers of the entire empire, or at all events aspire to be so. Consequently it is impossible to suppose that it is vassal princes that are represented by those subordinate wings; rather must we hold, with Corrodi (*Gesch. des Chiliasmus*, i. 207), that it is "governors, rival candidates for the throne, and rebels," or with Dillmann (Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. vol. xii. p. 312), that it is "Roman generals and pretenders" that are in view. Of course we have had to avail ourselves of the better known among the usurpers in order to complete the number twelve. But it would appear that the author reckons along with them all those Roman generals who, during the period of disorder (68-70), had at any time put forward claims to the throne. And of these surely it would not be difficult to make out six. For it is only a question of six, seeing that, as has been already noticed, the last two of the subordinate wings do not represent actual historical personages.

If the view which represents the three heads as referring to the Flavian emperors be correct, it should not be difficult to determine the date of the composition of our book. We have already seen that the author wrote during the reign of the third head, inasmuch as he is already acquainted with the manner in which the second was put to death, while on the other hand he is looking forward to the overthrow of the third after the Messiah has made His appearance. Consequently the composition of the book is not, with Corrodi and Ewald, to be referred to so early a date as the time of Titus, nor again, with Volkmar, Langen, Hausrath and Renan, to one so late as the time of Nerva, but, with Gfrörer, Dillmann, Wieseler and Reuss, to the reign of Domitian (81-96 A.D.).

The designation *Fourth Book of Ezra*, under which our work is known, is current only in the Latin Church, and is to be traced to the fact that the canonical books Ezra and Nehemiah were reckoned as First and Second Ezra respectively, while the Ezra of the Greek Bible was regarded as Third Ezra (so Jerome, *Praef. in version. libr. Ezrae*, *Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1524: Nec

quemquam moveat, quod unus a nobis editus liber est; nec apocryphorum tertii et quarti somniis delectetur). This mode of designating those different books has also been retained in the official Roman Vulgate, where Third and Fourth Ezra are inserted at the end of the New Testament. In the manuscript of Amiens, from which Bensly edited the Latin fragment, the canonical books Ezra and Nehemiah taken together are regarded as First Ezra, the so-called Third Ezra is counted as Second Ezra, while Fourth Ezra is divided into three books, chaps. i.-ii. being counted as Third Ezra, chaps. iii.-xiv. as Fourth Ezra, and chaps. xv., xvi. as Fifth Ezra (Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, p. 6). Similarly, though with greater complication still, in the *Codex Sangermanensis* and the manuscripts derived from it (Bensly, p. 85 sq.). The earliest designation seems to have been "Εσδρας ὁ προφήτης (Clemens Alex. *Strom.* iii. 16. 100) or "Εσδρα αποκάλυψις, for it is doubtless our Fourth Book of Ezra that is meant by the apocryphal work bearing that name which occurs in the list of the Apocrypha edited by Montfaucon, Cotelier, Hody and Pitra (see p. 126). For more on the different titles, see Volkmar, *Das vierte Buch Ezra*, p. 3. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum*, pp. xviii.-xxi.

Use and high repute of the book in the Christian Church.—It is probable that it is this work that is referred to in the following passage in the Epistle of Barnabas, chap. xii.: "Ομοίως πάλιν περὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ ὀρίζει ἐν ἄλλῃ προφῆτῃ λέγοντι· Καὶ τότε ταῦτα συντισθήσεται; λέγει κύριος· Ὅταν ἔξωλον κλιθῇ καὶ ἀναστῇ, καὶ ὅταν ἐν ἔξωλον αἷμα στάξῃ. Comp. Fourth Ezra, iv. 33: Quomodo et quando haec? . . . v. 5: Si de ligno sanguis stillabit. It is true that here the first half of the quotation is wanting, but for all that Le Moyne and Fabricius (*Cod. pseudepigr.* ii. 184) were undoubtedly correct in tracing it to Fourth Ezra. Comp. further, Cotelier, Hilgenfeld and Harnack in their editions of the Epistle of Barnabas; Hilgenfeld, *Die apostol. Väter*, p. 47. It is also extremely probable that we are indebted to Fourth Ezra for the legend to the effect that, when the *Holy Scriptures* had perished on the occasion of the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, *Ezra completely restored them again by means of a miracle*. So Irenaeus, iii. 21. 2. Tertullian, *De cultu femin.* i. 3. Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 22. 149. Comp. Fourth Ezra xiv. 18-22 and 37-47. Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr.* i. 1156-1160. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum*, p. 107. Strack in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. vii. 414 sq. (art. "Kanon des A. T.'s").

The first express quotation occurs in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* iii. 16. 100: Διὰ τί γὰρ οὐκ ἐγένετο ἡ μήτρα τῆς μητρὸς μου τὰφος, ἵνα μὴ ἴδω τὸν μόχθον τοῦ Ἰακώβ καὶ τὸν κόπον τοῦ γένους Ἰσραὴλ; "Εσδρας ὁ προφήτης λέγει. Comp. 4 Ezra v. 35. Our book is repeatedly used and quoted as prophetic, above all by Ambrose. See the passages in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* ii. pp. 183, 185 sqq. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum*, p. xxii. sq. Le Hir, *Etudes Bibliques*, i. 142. Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, pp. 74-76. It is also quoted as *propheta Esdras* in the so-called *Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum* printed among Chrysostom's works (ed. Montfaucon, vol. vi.), *Homil.* xxxiv. s. fin. Jerome, who maintains a critical attitude toward the Apocrypha generally, is the only one who expresses himself unfavourably. See the passage quoted above from the *Praef. in version. libr. Ezrae*,

and especially *Adv. Vigilantium*, chap. vi. (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 393): Tu vigilans dormis et dormiens scribis et proponis mihi librum apocryphum, qui sub nomine Esdrae a te et similibus tui legitur, ubi scriptum est, quod post mortem nullus pro aliis audeat deprecari, quem ego librum numquam legi. Quid enim necesse est in manus sumere, quod ecclesia non recepit. But although our book continued to be excluded from the canon, it nevertheless enjoyed a wide circulation, especially in the Middle Ages. Bensly has proved by actual verification that it finds a place in more than sixty Latin manuscripts of the Bible (Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, pp. 42, 82 sqq.), and this without taking into account scarcely any of the Italian libraries. As we have already mentioned, it appears in the official Vulgate as an appendix. It also finds a place in not a few German editions of the Bible, Lutheran and Reformed as well as Catholic (for the evidence in regard to this, see Gildemeister, *Esdrae liber quartus arabice*, 1877, p. 42). On the history of the use, comp. further, Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr.* ii. 174-192. Idem, *Cod. apocryph. Nov. Test.* i. 936-938. Volkmar, *Das vierte Buch Esra*, p. 273 sq. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum*, pp. xviii.-xxiv., lxix. sq.

Care must be taken not to confound the Fourth Book of Ezra with the Christian work entitled the *Apocalypse of Ezra* which Tischendorf has edited (*Apocalypses apocryphae*, Lips. 1866, pp. 24-38). On this comp. Tischendorf, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1851, p. 423 sqq. Idem, *Prolegom.* to his edition, pp. 12-14. Le Hir, *Etudes Bibliques* (Paris 1869), ii. 120-122. By the Ἑδρα ἀποκάλυψις, which occurs in the list of the Apocrypha edited by Montfaucon, Pitra and others, it is possibly the Fourth Book of Ezra that is meant (see p. 126). On the Ezra-Apocrypha, comp. also Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 1162. On the later additions to the Fourth Book of Ezra (chaps. i.-ii. and xv. xvi.), which in the manuscripts appear as yet as separate Books of Ezra, and which came for the first time to be blended with the main work in the printed text, see Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. xii. 356, and Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, pp. 35-40.

The texts of the Fourth Book of Ezra that have come down to us are the following:—

(1.) The old Latin version, which is the most literal, and therefore the most important of all. The vulgar text, as it had long been printed, was extremely inaccurate. In the edition of Fabricius (*Codex pseudepigraphus Vet. Test.* vol. ii. 1723, pp. 173-307) the Arabic version, which was given to the public through Ockley's English translation in 1711, was collated throughout with the Latin text. Sabatier was the first to lay the foundation for the critical restoration of the text by his publication of the variants of the important *Codex Sangermanensis* (Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. iii. 1743, pp. 1038, 1069-1084). Numerous emendations based upon the *Codex Sangermanensis*, and the Ethiopic version published by Laurence in 1820, were proposed by Van der Vlis (*Disputatio critica de Esdrae libro apocrypho vulgo quarto dicto*, Amstelod. 1839). The first critical edition was published by Volkmar (*Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apocryphen*, second part: *Das vierte Buch Esra*, Tüb. 1868). In this edition Sabatier's collation of the *Cod. Sangermanensis* and a Zürich manu-

script collated by Volkmar himself were made use of. These manuscripts however were not collated with sufficient care, as the subsequent editions of Hilgenfeld (*Messias Judaeorum*, Lips. 1869) and Fritzsche (*Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece*, Lips. 1871) have shown. Both these writers give the Latin text according to three different manuscripts: (a) the *Cod. Sangermanensis* saec. ix., collated anew for Hilgenfeld's edition by Zotenberg; (b) the *Cod. Turicensis* saec. xiii., also collated anew for Hilgenfeld's edition by Fritzsche; (c) a *Cod. Dresdensis* saec. xv., collated by Hilgenfeld. In the whole of those editions a considerable fragment is wanting between chaps. vii. 35 and vii. 36, which could only be supplied from the Oriental versions. This fragment was first discovered, so far as the Latin text is concerned, by Benaly in a manuscript at Amiens (formerly at Corbie near Amiens) in the year 1875 (Benaly, *The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra*, discovered and edited with an Introduction and Notes, Cambridge 1875. *Comp. Theol. Literaturztg.* 1876, p. 43 sq.). After this it was also published by Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1876, pp. 421-435). Two years after this again the same fragment was edited from a Madrid manuscript (formerly in Alcalá de Henares) by Wood, and from among the remains of John Palmer the Orientalist († 1840), who had transcribed it as early as the year 1826 (*Journal of Philology*, vol. vii. 1877, pp. 264-278). Besides the manuscripts hitherto mentioned, Benaly (pp. 42, 82 sqq.) has verified some sixty others of the Latin text.³¹ Those of them in which there is the large hiatus in chap. vii., and this holds true of probably the whole of them, at all events of the *Turicensis* and the *Dresdensis*, as also of the printed vulgar text, are of no value, for the hiatus in the *Cod. Sangermanensis* was due to the cutting out of a leaf, so that all the manuscripts and texts in which precisely the same hiatus occurs must have followed that codex (as from a letter addressed to Benaly, Gildemeister appears to have already noted in the year 1865). Consequently in the case of any future edition consideration will be due, in the first instance, only to: (a) the *Cod. Sangermanensis* (now in Paris), dating from the year 822 A.D. (Benaly, p. 5); (b) the Amiens manuscript, also belonging to the ninth century, and independent of the *Cod. Sanger.*; and (c) the Madrid manuscript. At the same time we may observe that the Latin manuscripts of the Bible in the majority of the Italian libraries have not yet been examined in connection with our book.

(2.) Next to the Latin the best and most trustworthy version is the Syriac, which has been transmitted to us in the large Peshito manuscript of Milan (*Cod. Ambros.* B. 21, Inf.). It was published for the first time by Ceriani first of all in a Latin version (Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. i. fasc. 2, Mediol. 1866, pp. 99-124), then in the Syriac text itself (Ceriani, *Mon. sac. et prof.* vol. v. fasc. 1, Mediol. 1868, pp. 4-111). This latter is also given in the photo-lithographed facsimile of the whole manuscript (*Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex cod. Ambr. photolithographice*, ed. Ceriani, 2 vols. in 4 parts, Milan 1876-1883; comp. vol.

³¹ On two Parisian and two Berlin manuscripts, see Gildemeister, *Esdrae liber quartus Arabice*, 1877, p. 44 *fin.*

iii. p. 92). Hilgenfeld has embodied Ceriani's Latin version in his *Messias Judaeorum* (Lips. 1869).

(3.) The Ethiopic version, which is also of importance for the reconstruction of the original text. It had been previously published by Laurence, accompanied with a Latin and English version, but only from a *single* manuscript, and not quite free from errors (Laurence, *Primi Ezrae libri, qui apud Vulgatam appellatur quartus, versio Aethiopica, nunc primo in medium prolata et Latine Angliceque reddita*, Oxoniae et Londoni 1820). Numerous corrections have been made by van der Vlis (*Disputatio critica de Ezrae libro apocrypho vulgo quarto dicto*, Amst. 1839). A collection of the variants in the other manuscripts has been furnished by Dillmann in the appendix to Ewald's dissertation in the *Abhandlungen der Göttinger Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* vol. xi. 1862-1863. Then, in the last place, Prätorius, availing himself of Dillmann's collection of variants, and also collating with a Berlin manuscript, has made various emendations in the Latin version which Hilgenfeld has embodied in his *Messias Judaeorum* (Lips. 1869). A critical edition is still a desideratum. Among the Ethiopic manuscripts of the so-called Magdala collection, which some years ago were forwarded to the British Museum at the close of the war between the English and King John of Abyssinia, there happen to be no fewer than eight of our book (see Wright's catalogue in the *Zeitschr. der DMG.* 1870, p. 599 sqq., Nos. 5, 10, 11, 13, 23, 24, 25, 27. Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, p. 2, note 3).

(4.) The two Arabic versions are of but secondary importance, owing to the great freedom in which their authors often indulge. (a) One of them, which is in a manuscript in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, was in the first instance published only in an English version by Ockley (in Whitson's *Primitive Christianity revived*, vol. iv. London 1711). Ewald was the first to publish the Arabic text (*Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* vol. xi. 1862-1863). Emendations upon Ockley's version and Ewald's text were furnished by Steiner (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1868, pp. 426-433), with whose assistance Hilgenfeld also composed a Latin rendering for his *Messias Judaeorum* (Lips. 1869). The Arabic version here in question is also found in a Codex Vaticanus, which, though merely a transcript of the one in the Bodleian library, is nevertheless of some value in so far as it was copied before the leaf, which is at present wanting in the Bodleian codex, went amissing (Bensly, *The Missing Fragment*, p. 77 sq. Gildemeister, *Ezrae liber quartus*, p. 3; this latter supplies at pp. 6-8 the text of this fragment, which is omitted in Ewald's edition). (b) An extract from another Arabic version is likewise found in a Bodleian codex, from which it has been edited by Ewald (as above). A German version of this extract was furnished by Steiner (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaft. Theol.* 1868, pp. 396-425). On the extract itself, comp. further, Ewald, *Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* 1863, pp. 163-180. The complete text of this version was published by Gildemeister in Arabic and Latin from a Codex Vaticanus (*Ezrae liber quartus arabice, e codice Vaticano nunc primum edidit*, Bonnae 1877).

(5.) The Armenian version, which is still freer than the Arabic one, and

is of but little service for the restoration of the original text. It was published as early as the year 1805 in the edition of the Armenian Bible issued under the superintendence of the Mechitarists, but Ceriani was the first to rescue it from oblivion, while Ewald again furnished specimens of it in a German rendering (*Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* 1865, pp. 504-516). A Latin version, prepared by Petermann and based upon a collation of four manuscripts, is given in Hilgenfeld's *Messias Judaeorum* (Lips. 1869). In the older editions of the Armenian Bible (the first dating as far back as 1666) there is an Armenian version of our book which was prepared by the first editor, Uscanus himself, and taken from the Vulgate (see Scholtz, *Einl. in die heiligen Schriften*, vol. i. 1845, p. 501. Gildemeister, *Esdrae liber quartus arabice*, p. 43. This may be made use of for the purpose of correcting Bensly, p. 2, note 2).

German versions of our book have been published by Volkmar (*Das vierte Buch Esra*, 1863) and Ewald (*Transactions of the Göttingen Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* vol. xi. 1862, 1863), while Hilgenfeld attempted a rendering back into the Greek (*Messias Judaeorum*, Lips. 1869).

Critical inquiries. For the earlier literature, see Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr.* ii. 174 sqq. Lücke, *Einl.* p. 187 sqq. Volkmar, *Das vierte Buch Esra* (1863), pp. 273-275, 374 sqq. Hilgenfeld, *Messias Judaeorum*, p. liv. sqq. Corrodi (also spelt Corodi), *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, vol. i. (1781) pp. 179-230. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils* (also under the title, *Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, vols. i., ii.), 1838, i. 69-93. Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes* (2nd ed. 1852), pp. 144-212. Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, pp. 982-990 (review of Lücke's *Einl.*). Noack, *Der Ursprung des Christenthums*, vol. i. (1857) pp. 341-363. Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalypitik* (1857), pp. 185-242. Idem, *Die Propheten Esra und Daniel*, 1863. Idem, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theologie*, vol. i. 1858, pp. 250-270; iii. 1860, pp. 385-358; vi. 1863, pp. 229-292, 457 sq.; x. 1867, pp. 87-91, 263-295; xiii. 1870, pp. 308-319; xix. 1876, pp. 421-435. Gutachmid, "Die Apokalypse des Esra und ihre späteren Bearbeitungen" (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1860, pp. 1-81). Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. vol. xii. 1860, pp. 310-312; 2nd ed. vol. xii. 1883, pp. 353-356 (art. "Pseudepigraphen"). Volkmar, *Handbuch der Einleitung in die Apokryphen*, second part: *Das vierte Buch Esra*, Tüb. 1863. At a previous date by the same author, *Das vierte Buch Esra und apokalyptische Geheimnisse überhaupt*, Zürich 1858. "Einige Bemerkungen über Apokalypitik" (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1861, pp. 83-92). Ewald, "Das vierte Esrabuch nach seinem Zeitalter, seinen arabischen Uebersetzungen und einer neuen Wiederherstellung" (*Transactions of the Royal Gesellsch. der Wissensch. of Göttingen*, vol. xi. 1862-1863, histor.-philol. section, pp. 133-230. Also as a separate reprint). Idem, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. vii. 3rd ed. 1868, pp. 69-83. Ceriani, "Sul Das vierte Esrabuch del Dottor Enrico Ewald" (*Estratto dalle Memorie del R. Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere*), Milano 1865. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, 1866, pp. 112-139. Le Hir, "Du IV.^e livre d'Esdra" (*Etudes Bibliques*, 2 vols. Paris 1869, i. 139-250). Wieseler, "Das vierte Buch Esra nach Inhalt und Alter untersucht" (*Stud.*

u. Krit. 1870, pp. 268-304). Keil, *Lehrb. der histor.-krit. Einleitung in die kanon. und apokr. Schriften des A. T.* 3rd ed. 1873, pp. 758-764. Haurath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. iv. 80-88 (1st ed. iii. 282-289). Renan, "L'apocalypse de l'an 97" (*Revue des deux Mondes*, 1875, March, pp. 127-144). Idem, *Les évangiles*, 1877, pp. 348-373. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, 1877, pp. 84-117. Reuss, *Gesch. der heiligen Schriften Allen Testaments* (1881), sec. 597.

6. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.*

In the pseudepigraphic prophecies which we have hitherto been considering, revelations and predictions—and therefore the apocalyptic element—chiefly predominated. But just as these revelations themselves had practical objects as their ultimate aim, such objects as the strengthening and comforting of the faithful, so alongside of them there was also another class of works in which the exhortations and encouragements were more directly expressed. We have a pseud-epigraphic prophecy of this description in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, which is chiefly composed of such direct exhortations. This somewhat extensive work has come down to us in its entirety in the *Greek text*, which was published for the first time by Grabe (1698), although, from the beginning of the sixteenth century, a good many printed copies of a Latin version prepared in the thirteenth by Robert Grossetest, Bishop of Lincoln, had been in circulation.

The book, as we now have it, contains a great many direct allusions to the incarnation of God in Christ, for which reason almost all modern critics look upon it as the production of a *Christian* author. But it is extremely doubtful whether this is a correct view of the matter, and whether we ought not rather to assume that the work in its original form is of Jewish authorship, and that the passages that are of a Christian character were interpolated at some later date. As is indicated by the title itself, the book consists of the spiritual "testaments" which the twelve sons of Jacob left behind them for their descendants. *In each of those testaments three different elements may be distinguished.* (1) The patriarch in each

instance rehearses in the first place *the history of his own life*, in the course of which he either charges himself with sins he has committed (as is done by the majority of them), or on the other hand boasts of his virtues. The biographical notices follow the lines of the Biblical narrative, although, after the fashion of the Haggadean Midrash, they are enriched with a large number of fresh details. (2) The patriarch then proceeds to address to his descendants a number of *appropriate exhortations* based upon the preceding autobiographical sketch, urging them to beware of the sin that had been the cause of such deep distress to their ancestor, and in the event of his being able to boast of something redounding to his credit, recommending them to imitate his virtuous behaviour. The subject on which the exhortations turn is, as a rule, one that happens to have a very intimate connection with the biographical notices, the patriarch's descendants being warned precisely against that sin or, it may be, to imitate that virtue which had been exemplified in his own life. (3) But besides this, we also find toward the end of each of the testaments (with the exception perhaps of that of Gad, where this point is only briefly hinted at) certain *predictions* regarding the future of the particular tribe in question, the patriarch for example predicting that his descendants would one day apostatize from God or, what sometimes appears to amount to the same thing, sever their connection with the tribes of Levi and Judah, and thereby involve themselves in misery, and especially the evils of captivity and dispersion. This prediction is frequently accompanied with an exhortation to adhere to the tribes of Levi and Judah. On the other hand, these predictions are interspersed with a large number of very direct references to redemption through Christ.

The circles of thought in these "testaments" are of a very heterogeneous character. On the one hand, they contain a great deal that it seems impossible to explain except on the assumption that they were composed by a Jewish author. The history of the patriarchs is amplified precisely in the style

of the Haggadean Midrash. The author assumes that salvation is in store only for the children of Shem, while those of Ham are doomed to destruction (Simeon vi.). He manifests a lively interest in the Jewish tribes as such; he deplores their apostasy and dispersion; he exhorts them to cleave to the tribes of Levi and Judah as being those which God has specially called to be the leaders of the others;³² he cherishes the hope of their ultimate conversion and deliverance. It is true, no doubt, that in his positive injunctions he nowhere inculcates the observance of the ceremonial law, such injunctions being more of a moral character throughout nearly the entire book, and consisting for example of warnings against the sins of envy, avarice, anger, lying, incontinency, exhortations to the love of one's neighbour, compassion, integrity, and such like. But at the same time he does not fail to speak of the priestly sacrificial worship, and that even with many details introduced into it not met with in the Old Testament itself, as being an institution of divine appointment.³³ On the other hand again we also meet with numerous passages which can only have been written by a Christian, passages which teach the Christian doctrine of the universal character of salvation as well as that of redemption through the incarnation of God, nay in one instance there is a distinct reference to the

³² Reuben vi.: Τῷ γὰρ Λευὶ ἴδως Κύριος τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τῷ 'Ιούδα. Judah xxi.: Καὶ νῦν, τέκνα, ἀγαπήσατε τὸν Λευί, ἵνα διαμείνητε καὶ μὴ ἐκπίρσθε ἐκ' αὐτόν, ἵνα μὴ ἐξολοθριυθῇτε. 'Εμοὶ γὰρ ἴδως Κύριος τὴν βασιλείαν, καὶ κείνη τὴν ἱερωτείαν, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτὴν τὴν βασιλείαν τῇ ἱερουσύῃ. Issachar v. fin.: Καὶ ὁ Λευὶ καὶ ὁ 'Ιούδας ἰδοξάσθη παρὰ Κυρίου ἐν νόμοις 'Ιακώβ. Καὶ γὰρ Κύριος ἐκλήρουσεν ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τῷ μὲν ἴδως τὴν ἱερωτείαν, τῷ δὲ τὴν βασιλείαν. Dan v.: Οἶδω γὰρ ὅτι ἐν ἰσχύταις ἡμέραις ἀποστήσεις τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ προσωχθίεις τὸν Λευὶ καὶ πρὸς 'Ιούδαν ἀντιτάξασθαι. Naphtali v. (in a parable): Καὶ ὁ Λευὶ ἐκράτησε τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ ὁ 'Ιούδας φθάσας ἐπίσπευε τὴν σελήνην. Ibid. viii.: Καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἐντείλασθε τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, ἵνα ἐνέονται τῷ Λευὶ καὶ τῷ 'Ιούδα.

³³ Levi ix. Note for example the prescription: Καὶ πρὸ τοῦ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὰ ἁγία λούου' καὶ ἐν τῷ θύειν, νίπτου (with which comp. vol. i. p. 278); further, the prescription in the same passage to the effect that no wood was to be used for the altar of burnt-offering but that of trees which were always in leaf (comp. Book of Jubilees, chap. xxi., in Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 19).

Apostle Paul (Benjamin xi.). The Christology upon which those passages proceed is of a decidedly patripassian character.³⁴

Grabe, who was the first to edit the Greek text, already endeavoured to account for those incongruities by the hypothesis, that the book was written by a Jew, but had been subsequently interpolated by a Christian. All modern critics however (since Nitzsch) have entirely dismissed this hypothesis, and the only point on which there is a difference of opinion amongst them is as to whether the author occupied the standpoint of a *Jewish* or a *Gentile* Christian. The former is the prevailing view; the latter was propounded by Ritschl in the first edition of his *Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, was subsequently adopted by Vorstman and Hilgenfeld, but was ultimately abandoned again by Ritschl himself. At the same time there was no doubt a feeling on the part of many that it would be impossible to solve the difficulty without having recourse to the interpolation hypothesis. Kayser above all tried to demonstrate the existence of a tolerably large number of such interpolations. But even in his case the matter is dealt with only incidentally, to enable him to maintain the view as to the Jewish-Christian character of the writing. It was reserved for Schnapp to enter in a systematic manner into the question as to whether the whole work had not been reconstructed from beginning to end. He endeavoured to show, that to the book in its original form belonged only the parts mentioned under Nos. 1 and 2 above, i.e. merely the biographical narratives and their accompanying exhortations. But he seeks to prove that all those portions in which the future fortunes of the tribes are predicted, with

³⁴ Simeon vi.: Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς μέγας τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, φαινόμενος ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἄνθρωπος. *Ibid.*: Θεὸς σῶμα λαβὼν καὶ συνεισὶν ἀνθρώποις ἴσους ἀνθρώπου. Issachar vii.: ἔχοντες μὲθ' ἑαυτῶν τὸν Θεὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, συμπαρανόμενοι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐν ἀπλότητι καρδίας. Zebulon ix. fin.: ἔψαθε Θεὸν ἐν σχήματι ἀνθρώπου. Dan v. fin.: Κύριος ἵσταται ἐμμέσῳ αὐτῆς, τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναναστροφόμενος. Naphtali viii.: ὀφθάνεται Θεὸς κατοικῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Asher vii.: ἕως οὗ ὁ ὕψιστος ἐπισκίψῃται τὴν γῆν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔλθων ὡς ἄνθρωπος μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἰσθίει καὶ πίνει. Benjamin x.: παραγενόμενοι Θεὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλευθερωτὴν οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν.

some other things of a kindred nature (visions in particular), are to be regarded as later interpolations, though he distinguishes at the same time between Jewish and Christian interpolations. He thinks that the bulk of these interpolations would be made by a Jewish hand, but that into these again numerous references to the redemption through Christ had been afterwards inserted by a Christian hand. He considers therefore that the original work itself must also have been of Jewish origin. It appears to me that the latter part of this hypothesis, in so far, that is, as the Christian revision is concerned, has at all events hit the mark. It would be vain to attempt to reduce the heterogeneous utterances in our Testaments to a common Jewish-Christian standpoint, all of them that bear a specifically Christian stamp being without exception of a Gentile-Christian and universalist character. The salvation is destined *εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*. The Christology is the patripassian Christology that so largely prevailed in many quarters in the Christian Church during the second and third centuries. There is nothing here that can be said to indicate a "Jewish-Christian" standpoint. Again it is impossible to reconcile with the Christian passages in question that series of utterances characterized above which can only have emanated from a Jewish author. How is it ever to be supposed that a Christian, ay, or even a Jewish-Christian, author should think of characterizing the tribes of *Levi* and *Judah* as those to whom God had committed the guidance of Israel. Then what could we conceive such an author to mean by exhorting the rest of the tribes to join themselves to the two just mentioned and to submit themselves to their authority? Why, it was precisely the tribes of Levi and Judah, i.e. the official Judaism of Palestine, that distinguished themselves above all the others in the way of rejecting the gospel. We can hardly imagine therefore that even a Jewish-Christian author would be likely to represent them as occupying the leading position above referred to. Nor does he so represent them as one who is merely taking a

theoretical survey of history, and as though he meant to censure the defection from the tribes of Levi and Judah merely as a thing of the past. But he also urges a loyal adherence to those tribes as a present duty. Nor can we here suppose that Levi is intended to represent the Christian clergy. For what in that case would Judah be supposed to represent? ^{34a} Then there is the further circumstance, that many of the Christian passages obviously disturb the connection and thus proclaim themselves to be interpolations at the very outset. What is more, the much canvassed passage regarding Paul in the Testament of Benjamin (xi.) is wanting in the case of two independent testimonies among the manuscripts and versions as at present known to us, namely in the Roman manuscript and the Armenian version.³⁵ From all this it may be regarded as tolerably certain, that *all the Christian passages are to be ascribed to some interpolator* who, with a Jewish original before him, introduced modifications here and there to adapt it to the purposes and needs of the Christian Church. This assumption will also enable us to explain how it comes to be stated in our Testaments that Christ was a descendant of the tribes of Levi and Judah alike.³⁶ How it

^{34a} That the various utterances regarding the tribes of Levi and Judah are of a strictly Jewish character, may be further seen from others of a precisely similar nature in the Book of Jubilees, chap. xxxi. (Ewald's *Jahrbücher*, iii. 39 sq.).

³⁵ See Sinker, *Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum*, Appendix (1879), pp. 27 and 59; and Harnack's notice in *Theol. Literaturztg.* 1879, p. 515. The Roman manuscript has the original text in still another passage (perhaps in more?), where the others show that passage to have undergone a Christian revision. Simeon vii. according to the Roman MS. runs thus: *Καὶ νῦν, τεινία μου, ἐπακούσας τοῦ Ἀσὺλ καὶ τοῦ Ἰούδα*, as without doubt it was originally written, whereas the Cambridge MS. reads: *Καὶ νῦν, τεινία μου, ἐπακούσας Ἀσὺλ καὶ ἐν Ἰούδα λυτρωθήσῃσθε*.

³⁶ Simeon vii.: *Ἀναστήσει γὰρ Κύριος ἐκ τοῦ Ἀσὺλ ὡς ἀρχιερεὺς καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Ἰούδα ὡς βασιλεὺς, Θεὸν καὶ ἄνθρωπον*. Levi ii.: *διὰ σοῦ καὶ Ἰούδα ἐδόθηται Κύριος ἐν ἀνθρώποις*. Dan v.: *Καὶ ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα καὶ Ἀσὺλ τὸ σωτήριον Κυρίου*. Gad viii.: *ὅπως τιμήσωσιν Ἰούδαν καὶ τὸν Ἀσὺλ ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ Κύριος σωτῆρα τῇ Ἰσραήλ*. Joseph xix.: *τιμᾶτε τὸν Ἰούδαν καὶ τὸν Ἀσὺλ ὅτι ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀνατελεῖ ὑμῖν ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, χάριτι σώζων πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*.

would ever occur to a Christian author himself to emphasize this point so much, even supposing Mary to have belonged to the tribe of Levi, it is difficult to see, for in the primitive Christian tradition it was only upon the descent from Judah that stress was laid. But the matter becomes perfectly intelligible when we assume that the author had a text before him in which *Levi* and *Judah* were held up as the chosen and model tribes. For finding this in his text he proceeds to justify it from his Christian standpoint by representing Christ as descended from the tribe of Levi in His capacity as priest, and from that of Judah in His capacity as king, it being left an open question whether he assumes the Levitical descent of Mary or has in view only some spiritual connection on the part of Christ with both those tribes in virtue of His twofold office of priest and king.⁸⁷ It is further worthy of note that, deviating from his Jewish original, the Christian interpolator as a rule puts the tribe of Judah first. How long or short those Christian interpolations may have been it is not always possible to determine with any degree of certainty. It is probable however that they were on a larger scale than Schnapp is inclined to suppose.

It is rather more difficult to answer this other question, namely, whether this Jewish original itself was not the production of several authors. The grounds on which Schnapp bases his attempt to distinguish and eliminate the prophetic portions of the book are not quite so cogent in the case of Christian passages. At the same time, there is no denying that in most instances those predictions start up in the book

⁸⁷ This latter view is favoured by Simeon vii.; at the same time it is possible that, on the strength of Luke i. 36 (Ἐλισάβετ ἡ συγγενὶς σου), the author has assumed the Levitical descent of Mary, as many of the Fathers have also done (on which see Spitta, *Der Brief des Julius Africanus an Aristides*, 1877, p. 44 sqq.). But in any case it is certain that, previous to the author of the Testaments, no writer within the Church had ever directly maintained or in any way emphasized the Levitical descent of Jesus. For Hilgenfeld and, following him, Spitta, have contrived to elicit something of this from the words of Clemens Romanus, chap. xxxii., only by an exegesis of a very singular kind.

with a remarkable suddenness. The Testaments seem to have been intended, in the first instance, to serve as a kind of moral sermon. They concern themselves, as a rule, with some special sin or other of which the patriarch had been guilty and against which he warns his descendants. When we find then that all of a sudden, and in quite a general way, there comes in some prediction about the falling away of the tribes, and that without any further notice being taken of the special sin that had been previously treated of, it becomes evident at once that the connection is thereby interrupted and disturbed, all the more that the terms with which the Testaments conclude are such as imply that they had been preceded by exhortations, and exhortations alone. Comp. above all Simeon v.-vii.; Levi xiv.-xix.^a; Judah xxi.-xxv.; Dan v. In any case we can have no difficulty in detecting in the Testaments a good many interpolations of considerable length, even apart from those passages that are of a specifically Christian kind; take for example the two visions in the Testament of Levi ii.-v. and viii., which only interrupt the connection. Then in the biographical portion of the Testament of Joseph we find two perfectly parallel narratives coming the one immediately after the other (chaps. i.-x.^a and x.^b-xviii.), of which only one can be supposed to be the original one. Again in the course of what is said with regard to the tribe of Levi we come across this glaring contradiction, that while on the one hand it is recommended to the other tribes as their leader, it is represented on the other as having itself fallen away, nay as having been instrumental in seducing the rest into apostasy (Levi xiv.; Dan v.). Both those classes of statements cannot possibly have emanated from one and the same person. We may therefore say that in any case the Testaments have undergone repeated revision and remodification. But this much however may be held as certain, that the great bulk of the book is of Jewish origin. *The foremost place in it is assigned to these moral sermons, which remind us partly of Jesus the Son of Sirach, and partly of Philo, and*

which must have emanated from some author to whom moral conduct was a matter of deeper interest than the ceremonial law. Along with these we have prophetic passages composed by the same or some other author, in which the falling away from Levi and Judah is represented as being the cause of all evil, while the members of the nation, scattered throughout the whole world, are recommended to enter into close relationship with these tribes, therefore with the leading circles of Palestine. On the *date of the composition* of our book it is impossible to express anything like a definite opinion. As it is probable that the Christian revision was already known to Irenaeus, the Jewish original cannot have been composed later than the first century of our era, though, on the other hand, we can scarcely venture to refer it to an earlier date, seeing that the author probably made use of the Book of Jubilees (see below). In several passages the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple is presupposed (Levi xv.; Dan v. *fin.*). But it is extremely doubtful whether these are to be regarded as belonging to the work in its original shape. Possibly they were subsequently inserted by some Christian hand.

On the *references in our book to earlier writings*, see Sinker, *Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum* (1869), pp. 34-48; Dillmann in *Ewald's Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* iii. 91-94; Rösensch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen* (1874), pp. 325 sqq., 415 sqq. References to the predictions of Enoch are of very frequent occurrence (Simeon v.; Levi x., xiv., xvi.; Judah xviii.; Zebulon iii.; Dan v.; Naphtali iv.; Benjamin ix.). These passages all belong to the prophetic sections, though in the majority of instances they are not actual quotations, but free allusions to alleged predictions of Enoch, with the view of explaining how the patriarchs obtained their information with regard to the future. Surely from this it is perfectly obvious that the author must have already been acquainted with one or more of the various books bearing the name of Enoch. In the biographical portions therefore, in those sections which undoubtedly belong to the original work, there are numerous coincidences with the Book of Jubilees. But neither are these absent from those portions which, according to Schnapp, are supposed to belong to the author of the Jewish revision. See in general Dillmann and Rösensch, as above.

In *patristic literature* the notion of the descent of Christ from the tribes of Levi and Judah is met with as early as the time of Irenaeus, which notion is probably to be traced to our book; see Irenaeus, *Fragm.* xvii. (ed. Harvey, ii. 487): 'Εξ ὧν ὁ Χριστός προσηυχάθη καὶ ἐκγενήσθη καὶ ἐγεννήθη'

ἐν μὲν γὰρ τῇ 'Ιουδαίᾳ προσετυπώθη· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ Ἀσὺλ καὶ τοῦ 'Ιουδα τοῦ κατὰ γάρμα ὡς βασιλεῦς· καὶ ἱερὸς ἐγγινώσθη διὰ δὲ τοῦ Συμεὼν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐπεγγινώσθη κ.τ.λ. The passages in Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion.* v. 1, *Scorpiace* xiii., which since Grabe's time (*Spicileg.* i. 132) have usually been traced to the Testament of Benjamin xi., are simply based on Gen. xlix. 27; similarly *Hippolyt.* ed. Lagarde, p. 140, fragm. 50. It is not unlikely that the passage about Paul in Benjamin xi. would be inserted in the text of the Testament at a very late period, and that on the strength of the patristic interpretation of Gen. xlix. 27; comp. p. 119. The Testaments are expressly quoted by Origen, *In Josuam homil.* xv. 6 (ed. de la Rue, ii. 435; Lommatsch, xi. 143): Sed et in aliquo quodam libello, qui appellatur testamentum duodecim patriarcharum, quamvis non habeatur in canone, talem tamen quendam sensum invenimus, quod per singulos peccantes singuli satanae intelligi debeant (comp. Reuben iii.). It is doubtful whether Procopius Gazaens may be supposed to have our book in view in his *Comment. in Gen.* xxxviii. (see the passage in Sinker's *Test. XII. Patr.* p. 4). In the Stichometry of Nicephorus the Περὶ πατέρων are included among the ἀπὸ κρυφῶν along with Enoch, the Assumptio Mosis and such like (Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 121); similarly in the *Synopsis Athanasii* (Credner, p. 145) and in the anonymous list of canonical books edited by Montfaucon, Pitra and others (on which see p. 126 below). In the *Constitut. apostol.* vi. 16, mention is made of an apocryphal work entitled *ὁ τρις πατέρων*, which must be different from the book now in question, unless there has been some mistake with regard to the number.

Four manuscripts of the Greek text are extant: (1) A Cambridge one belonging to the tenth century; (2) an Oxford one belonging to the fourteenth (on both of which see Sinker's *Test. XII. Patr.* pp. vi.-xi.); (3) a manuscript in the Vatican Library belonging to the thirteenth century; and (4) one in the cloister of St. John in Patmos belonging to the sixteenth (on both of which again see Sinker, *Appendix*, 1879, pp. 1-7). In addition to these we should also mention, as independent testimonies, (1) the as yet unprinted Armenian version, eight manuscripts of which have been verified by Sinker, and the oldest of which dates from the year 1220 A.D. (Sinker, *Appendix*, pp. 23-27, and p. vii. sq.); and (2) the Old Slavonic version, which was published by Tichonrawow in his *Pamjatniki otretschennoi russkoi literatury* (2 vols. Petersburg 1863), but which has not yet been submitted to critical investigation.

As yet no trace has been discovered of any early Latin version. But coming down to the thirteenth century we find the Latin version of Robert Grossetest, Bishop of Lincoln, and which, as Sinker has shown, is based upon the Cambridge manuscript (see Grabe's *Spicileg.* i. 144; Sinker, *Appendix*, p. 8). This version has come down to us through numerous manuscripts (Sinker's *Test.* pp. xi.-xv., *Appendix*, p. 9), and, since the beginning of the sixteenth century, it has not only been frequently printed (at first without place or date being given, though probably about 1510-1520, see Sinker, *Appendix*, p. 10; on the later impressions consult Sinker, *Test.* p. xvi. sq.), but likewise translated into almost every modern language—English, French, German, Dutch, Danish, Icelandic, Bohemian, while

these translations again were also frequently printed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (Sinker, *Appendix*, pp. 11-23).

The first edition of the Greek text was prepared by Grabe, who based it upon the Cambridge manuscript, collating it at the same time with the Oxford one. This edition also contained Grossetest's Latin version, for which two manuscripts belonging to the Bodleian Library were made use of (Grabe, *Spicilegium Patrum*, vol. i. Oxon. 1698, 2nd ed. 1714; on the use of the manuscripts, see p. 336 sq.). Grabe's text has been reproduced by Fabricius (*Codex pseudepigraphus Vet. Test.* vol. i. Hamburg 1713), Gallandi (*Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, vol. i. Venetiis 1788), and Migne (*Patrolog. graec.* vol. ii.). A careful edition of the Cambridge manuscript, accompanied with the variants of the Oxford one, has been printed by Sinker (*Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum, ad fidem codicis Cantabrigiensis edita, accedunt lectiones cod. Oxoniensis*, Cambridge 1869). Some time after this same scholar published in an Appendix a collation of the Vatican and the Patmos manuscripts (*Testamenta XII. Patriarcharum: Appendix containing a collation of the Roman and Patmos MSS. and bibliographical notes*, Cambridge 1879).

Special disquisitions: Grabe in his edition (*Spicileg.* i. 129-144 and 335-374). Corrodi, *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, ii. 101-110. K. J. Nitzsch, *Commentatio critica de Testamentis XII. Patriarcharum, libro V. T. pseudepigrapho*, Wittenberg 1810. Wieseler, *Die 70 Wochen und die 63 Jahrwochen des Propheten Daniel* (1839), p. 226 sqq. Lücke, *Eink. in die Offenbarung Johannis* (2nd ed. 1852), pp. 334-337. Dörner, *Entwicklungsgesch. der Lehre von der Person Christi*, i. 254-264. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments*, § 257. Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der alt-kathol. Kirche* (2nd ed. 1857), pp. 172-177. Kayser, "Die Test. der XII. Patr.," in the *Beiträge zu den theologischen Wissenschaften*, edited by Reuss and Cunitz, 3 vols. (1851) pp. 107-140. Vorstman, *Disquisitio de Testamentorum Patriarcharum XII. origine et pretio*, Rotterd. 1857. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1858, p. 395 sqq.; 1871, p. 302 sqq. Van Hengel, "De Testamenten der twaalf Patriarchen op nieuw ter sprake gebracht" (*Godgeleerde Bijdragen*, 1860). Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vii. 363-369. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 140-157. Sinker in his edition. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, 1869, pp. 116-135; 1871, pp. 123-125. Friedr. Nitzsch, *Grundriss der christl. Dogmengeschichte*, vol. i. 1870, pp. 109-111. Renan, *L'église chrétienne* (1879), pp. 263-271. An article in *The Presbyterian Review* for January 1880 (mentioned by Bissell, *The Apocrypha*, p. 671). Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. xii. p. 361 sq. Schnapp, *Die Testamente der zwölf Patriarchen untersucht*, Halle 1884 (and notice of this work in the *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1885, p. 203).

7. The Lost Pseudepigraphic Prophecies.

Besides the pseudepigraphic prophecies that have come down to us, many others of a similar description were in

circulation in the early Church, as we learn partly from the lists of the canon and partly from quotations found in the Fathers. In the case of most of them it is of course no longer possible to determine with any certainty whether they were of Jewish or of Christian origin. But, considering that in the earliest days of the Christian Church this was a species of literary activity that flourished chiefly among the heretical sects, and that it was not till a somewhat later period that it began to be cultivated in Catholic circles as well, it may be assumed with some degree of probability that *those Old Testament pseudepigraphic writings which are mentioned in terms of high respect by the earliest of the Fathers, down say to Origen inclusive, are to be regarded generally as being of Jewish and not of Christian origin.* With the criterion thus obtained we may combine still another. We happen to have several *lists of the canon* in which the Old Testament Apocrypha are enumerated with great completeness. Now, among the writings thus enumerated, occur those which have come down to us (Enoch, the Twelve Patriarchs, the Assumptio Mosis, the Psalms of Solomon), and which are undoubtedly of Jewish origin. This then must surely be regarded as sufficiently justifying the conjecture that the others would also be of similar origin. The lists in question are the following:—

1. The so-called *Stichometry of Nicephorus*, i.e. a list of the canonical and apocryphal books of the Old and New Testaments along with the number of verses in each book, and which list is given as an appendix to the *Chronographia compendiaria* of Nicephorus Constantinopolitanus (about 800 A.D.), though it is, without doubt, of a considerably earlier origin (printed in the appendix to Dindorf's edition of George Syncellus, further in a critically amended text given by Credner in two programmes for the University of Giessen 1832–1838, and also reproduced in Credner's *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, 1847, pp. 117–122, but best of all in de Boor's *Nicephori opuscula*, Lips. 1880). Here the list of the Old Testament ἀπόκρυφα runs thus (ed. de Boor, p. 134 sq.):—

- α' Ἐνώχ στίχων δω' (4800).
 β' Πατριάρχαι στίχων ερ' (5100).
 γ' Προσευχὴ Ἰωσήφ στίχων αρ' (1100).
 δ' Διαθήκη Μωϋσέως στίχων αρ' (1100).
 ε' Ἀνάληψις Μωϋσέως στίχων αυ' (1400).
 ς' Ἀβραὰμ στίχων τ' (300).
 ζ' Ἐλὰδ (sic) καὶ Μωδὰδ στίχων υ' (400).
 η' Ἡλία προφήτου στίχων τις' (316).
 θ' Σοφονίου προφήτου στίχων χ' (600).
 ι' Ζαχαρίου πατρὸς Ἰωάννου στίχων φ' (500).
 ια' Βαρούχ, Ἀμβακούμ, Ἰεζεκιήλ καὶ Δανιήλ ψευδεπίγραφα.

2. The so-called *Synopsis Athanasii*, which simply reproduces from the *Stichometry of Nicephorus* the section containing the Apocrypha, without giving however the number of the verses (Credner, *Zur Geschichte des Kanons*, p. 145).

3. Akin to this latter is an *anonymous list* which was published: (a) from a *Codex Coislinianus* belonging to the tenth century by Montfaucon, *Bibliotheca Coisliniana*, Paris 1715, p. 194; (b) from a *Cod. Paris. Regius* by Cotelier, *Patrum Apost. Opp.* vol. i. 1698, p. 196; (c) from a *Cod. Baroccianus* by Hody, *De Bibliorum textibus*, 1705, p. 649, col. 44 (those three manuscripts are based upon each other in the order just given and as may be seen from a more careful comparing of them with the text); and lastly, (d) from a *Codex Vaticanus* by Pitra, *Juris ecclesiastici Graecorum historia et monumenta*, vol. i. Romae 1864, p. 100. As appears from the numbering, there is an omission in the three first-mentioned manuscripts (No. 8 being left out). According to Pitra, the complete list of the ὑπόκρυφα is as follows:—

- α' Ἀδάμ.
 β' Ἐνώχ.
 γ' Λάμεχ.
 δ' Πατριάρχαι.
 ε' Ἰωσήφ προσευχή.



ς' Ἑλδὰμ καὶ Μοδάμ (αλ. Ἑλδὰδ καὶ Μωδάδ).

ζ' Διαθήκη Μωσέως.

η' Ἡ ἀνάληψις Μωσέως.

θ' Ψαλμοὶ Σολομῶντος.

ι' Ἡλίου ἀποκάλυψις.

ια' Ἡσαίου δράσις.

ιβ' Σοφονίου ἀποκάλυψις.

ιγ' Ζαχαρίου ἀποκάλυψις.

ιδ' Ἑσδρα ἀποκάλυψις.

ιε' Ἰακώβου ἱστορία.

ισ' Πέτρου ἀποκάλυψις, and so on (these being followed by other New Testament Apocrypha).

This list is in the main identical with that of the *Stichometry of Nicephorus*. With a single exception (No. 6, Ἀβραάμ), the whole of the first ten numbers of the *Stichometry* are reproduced in it. But besides these nine numbers have this in common with each other, that they are probably all of them *prophetic pseudepigraphs*, i.e. writings purporting to have been composed by the various men of God whose names they bear, or at all events containing a record of revelations with which those men are alleged to have been favoured, a circumstance which probably accounts for their comparatively wide circulation throughout the Church. The last of the nine here in question shows by its title, *Ζαχαρίου πατρὸς Ἰωάννου*, that it belongs to the Christian Apocrypha. With regard to the others, four of them have already been considered by us (Enoch, the Patriarchs, the Testament and the Ascension of Moses; on the two latter, see p. 81), while the remaining four (Joseph's Prayer, Eldad and Modad, Elias, Zephaniah) are all quoted with deference either by Origen or by some still older Fathers, and may therefore be regarded, with a certain degree of probability, as *Jewish* products. Consequently they fall to be more fully considered by us here.

1. Joseph's Prayer (*Προσευχὴ Ἰωσήφ*). For the infor-

mation we possess regarding this production we are indebted above all to repeated quotations from it found in Origen. This Father speaks of it as "a writing not to be despised" (*οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητον γραφήν*), and expressly states that it was *in use among the Jews* (*παρ' Ἑβραίοις*). In the passages quoted it is Jacob who figures all through, describing himself as the first-born of all living beings, nay as the head of all the angels themselves. He informs us that when he was coming from Mesopotamia he met Uriel who wrestled with him, and claimed to be the foremost of the angels. But he says that he corrected him, and told him that he, Uriel, was only the eighth in rank after himself. In another passage Jacob states that he had had an opportunity of inspecting the heavenly records, and that there he read the future destinies of men.

Origen, *In Joann.* vol. ii. chap. xxv. (*Opp.* ed. de la Rue, iv. 84; Lommatzsch, i: 147): *Εἰ δὲ τις προσίται καὶ τῶν παρ' Ἑβραίοις φερομένων ἀπεκρύνων τὴν ἐπιγραφομένην Ἰωσήφ προσευχὴν, ἀπαικρὺς τοῦτο τὸ δόγμα καὶ σαφῶς εἰρημίζον ἐκίθει λήφεται . . . Φησὶ γοῦν ὁ Ἰακώβ: "Ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ἐγὼ Ἰακώβ καὶ Ἰσραὴλ, ἀγγεῖλος θεοῦ εἰμι ἐγὼ καὶ πνεῦμα ἀρχικόν" καὶ Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ προεκτίσθησαν πρὸ παντὸς ἔργου· ἐγὼ δὲ Ἰακώβ, ὁ κληθεὶς ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων Ἰακώβ, τὸ δὲ ὄνομά μου Ἰσραὴλ, ὁ κληθεὶς ὑπὸ θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ, ἀνὴρ ὅρων θεόν, ὅτι ἐγὼ πρωτόγονος παντὸς ζῶον ζουμένου ὑπὸ θεοῦ." Καὶ ἐπιφέρει: "Ἐγὼ δὲ ὅτι ἡρχόμενος ἀπὸ Μεσοποταμίας τῆς Συρίας, ἐξῆλθεν Οὐρίηλ ὁ ἀγγεῖλος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ εἶπεν, ὅτι κατίβην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ κατασκευάσω ἐν ἀσθράποις" καὶ ὅτι ἐκλήθην ὀνόματι Ἰακώβ, ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἐμαχισατό μοι, καὶ ἐπάλαμι πρὸς μὲ λέγων· προτιθήσειν ἐπάνω τοῦ ὀνόματός μου τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πρὸ [i. πρὸ τοῦ] παντὸς ἀγγέλου. Καὶ εἶπα αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ πόσος ἐστὶν ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ· οὐχὶ σὺ Οὐρίηλ δοῦλος ἡμοῦ, καὶ γὰρ Ἰσραὴλ ἀρχαγγεῖλος δυνάμεως κυρίου καὶ ἀρχιχιλίαρχός εἰμι ἐν υἱοῖς θεοῦ; οὐχὶ ἐγὼ Ἰσραὴλ ὁ ἐν προσώπῳ θεοῦ λειτουργὸς πρῶτος, καὶ ἐπικαλούμενος ἐν ὀνόματι ἀσβίστην τὸν θεόν μου."*

Origen, *ibid.* (Lommatzsch, i. 148): *Ἐπὶ πλείον δὲ παρεξίβημεν παραλαβόντες τὸν περὶ Ἰακώβ λόγον, καὶ μαρτυράμενοι ἡμῖν οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητον γραφήν.*

Origen, *Fragm. comment. in Genes.*³³ vol. iii. chap. ix. toward the end (ed. de la Rue, ii. 15; Lommatzsch, viii. 30 sq. = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* vi. 11. 64, ed. Gaisford): *Διόπερ ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ δύναται οὕτω νοῦσθαι τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰακώβ: "Ἀνύγων γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πλαξὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ὅσα συμβήσονται ὑμῖν καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς ὑμῶν."* Comp. also *ibid.* chap. xii. toward the

³³ The large fragment from the third book of the Commentary on Genesis is to be found in the *Philocalia*, chap. xxiii. (*Origenis Opp.* ed. Lommatzsch, vol. xxv.), and the most of it also in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* vi. 11.

end of the chapter (ed. de la Rue, ii. 19; Lommatzsch, viii. 38), where the contents of the somewhat lengthened fragment first quoted are given in an abridged form.

Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 761-771. Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 362.

2. The book entitled *Eldad and Modad*. This was a writing that was circulated under the name of two Israelites called עֲלִדָּאִים and מֹדָאִים (Sept. Ἐλδὰδ καὶ Μωδάδ), who according to Num. xi. 26-29 uttered certain predictions in the camp during the march through the wilderness. Besides being mentioned in the lists of the Apocrypha, this book is also quoted in the Shepherd of Hermas, and that as a genuine prophetical work. According to the *Targum of Jonathan* on Num. xi. 26-29, the predictions of the two personages here in question had reference chiefly to Magog's final attack upon the congregation of Israel. But whether this may be regarded as indicating what the theme of our book is likely to have been is extremely doubtful.

Hermas, *Pastor*, Vis. ii. 3: $\text{Ἐγγὺς κύριος τοῖς ἐπιστρεφόμενοις, ὡς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἐλδὰδ καὶ Μωδάτ, τοῖς προφητεύουσιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ.}$

The Targum of Jonathan on the Pentateuch is given in the fourth volume of the London Polyglot along with a Latin translation. Comp. also Beer, "Eldad und Medad im Pseudojonathan" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1857, pp. 346-350). Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, 1880, p. 370.

Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 801-804. Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 363. Cotelier, Hilgenfeld and Harnack in their editions of the Shepherd of Hermas, notes on Vision ii. 3.

3. The *Apocalypse of Elijah*. The prophet Elijah has this in common with Enoch, that like him he was taken up to heaven without dying. Consequently in the legends of the saints he is often associated with Enoch (for the literature of this, see Enoch, p. 70), and like this latter could not fail to be regarded as a peculiarly suitable medium through which to communicate heavenly revelations. A writing bearing his name is mentioned in the *Constitut. apostol.* vi. 16, and in the patristic quotations simply as an Apocryphum. According to the more exact titles as given in the lists of the

Apocrypha (*Ἡλία προφήτου* in Nicephorus, *Ἡλίου ἀποκάλυψις* in the anonymous list) and in Jerome (see below), this book was a somewhat short apocalyptic work consisting, according to the Stichometry of Nicephorus, of 316 verses. It is often mentioned by Origen and subsequent ecclesiastical writers as being the source of a quotation made by Paul, and which cannot be traced to any part of the Old Testament (1 Cor. ii. 9: *καθὼς γέγραπται· ἃ ὀφθαλμοὺς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη κ.τ.λ.*). No doubt Jerome strongly protests against the notion that Paul is here quoting an apocryphal work. But the thing is not at all incredible, for do we not find that the Book of Enoch has also been undoubtedly quoted by the author of the Epistle of Jude? If that be so, then this circumstance serves at the same time to prove the early existence and Jewish origin of the Apocalypse of Elijah. This same passage that is quoted in First Corinthians is likewise quoted by Clemens Romanus, chap. xxxiv. *fin.* Now as non-canonical quotations occur elsewhere in Clement, it is just possible that he, in like manner, has made use of the Apocalypse of Elijah. At the same time it is more likely that he has borrowed the quotation from the First Epistle to the Corinthians. According to Epiphanius, the passage Eph. v. 14 (*ἔγειρε ὁ καθεύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοι ὁ Χριστός*) was also taken from our Apocryphum. But seeing that Origen makes no mention of this in his collations of passages of this sort, that statement is of a very questionable character, and probably rests upon some confusion or other. According to Euthalius, Eph. v. 14 was taken from an apocryphal work that bore the name of Jeremiah.

Origen, *Comment. ad Matth.* xxvii. 9 (de la Rue, iii. 916; Lommatzsch, v. 29): *Et apostolus scripturas quasdam secretorum profert, sicut dicit alicubi: "quod oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit" (1 Cor. ii. 9); in nullo enim regulari libro hoc positum invenitur, nisi in secretis Eliae prophetae.* Comp. further, *Comment. ad Matt.* xxiii. 37 (de la Rue, iii. 848; Lommatzsch, iv. 237 sqq.), where, in connection with the saying of Christ that Jerusalem killed the prophets, Origen observes that the Old Testament records only a single

instance of a prophet being put to death in Jerusalem, and then proceeds to add: Propterea videndum, ne forte oporteat ex libris secretioribus, qui apud Judaeos feruntur, ostendere verbum Christi, et non solum Christi, sed etiam discipulorum ejus (for example such further statements as Heb. xi. 37) . . . Fertur ergo in scripturis non manifestis serratum esse Jesaiam, et Zachariam occisum, et Ezechielem. Arbitror autem circumsisse in melotis [*in μελωταῖς*, Heb. xi. 37], in pellibus caprinis Eliam, qui in solitudine et in montibus vagabatur. And so among the other passages that go to prove that apocryphal books are sometimes referred to in the New Testament we should also include 1 Cor. ii. 9. Lastly, Origen goes on to observe: Oportet ergo caute considerare, ut nec omnia secreta, quae feruntur in nomine sanctorum, suscipiamus propter Judaeos, qui forte ad destructionem veritatis scripturarum nostrarum quaedam finxerunt, confirmantes dogmata falsa, nec omnia abjiciamus, quae pertinent ad demonstrationem scripturarum nostrarum. The whole connection here plainly shows that it is exclusively Jewish Apocrypha that Origen has in view.

Euthalius in his learned statistical work on the Epistles of Paul (458 A.D.) likewise traces 1 Cor. ii. 9 to the Apocalypse of Elijah (Zaccagni, *Collectanea monumentorum veterum*, Romae 1698, p. 556=Gallandi, *Biblioth. patrum*, x. 258). In this he is followed by Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 48, and an anonymous list of quotations in Paul's Epistles, which is given (a) by Montfaucon (*Diarium Italicum*, p. 212 sq., and *Bibliotheca Bibliothecarum*, i. 195) from a *Codex Basilianus*, and (b) by Cotelier (in his edition of the Apostolic Fathers, note on *Constitut. apost.* vi. 16) from two Parisian manuscripts.

Jerome, *Epist. 57 ad Panmachium*, chap. ix. (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, i. 314): Pergamus ad apostolum Paulum. Scribit ad Corinthios: Si enim cognovissent Dominum gloriae, etc. (1 Cor. ii. 8-9). . . . Solent in hoc loco apocryphorum quidam deliramenta sectari et dicere, quod de apocalypsi Eliae testimonium sumtum sit, etc. (Jerome then traces the quotation to Isa. lxiv. 3). Idem, *Comment. in Jesaiam*, lxiv. 3 [*al.* lxiv. 4] (Vallarsi, iv. 761): Paraphrasim hujus testimonii quasi Hebraeus ex Hebraeis assumit apostolus Paulus de authenticis libris in epistola quam scribit ad Corinthios (1 Cor. ii. 9), non verbum ex verbo reddens, quod facere omnino contemnit, sed sensuum exprimens veritatem, quibus utitur ad id quod voluerit roborandum. Unde apocryphorum deliramenta conticeant, quae ex occasione hujus testimonii ingeruntur ecclesiae Christi. . . . Ascensio enim Isaiae et *Apocalypsis Eliae* hoc habent testimonium.

Clemens Rom. chap. xxxiv. fin.: λέγει γάρ 'Οφθαλμοὺς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὐς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν (in St. Paul: τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν). Comp. the note on this in Gebhardt and Harnack's edition. The passage is also frequently quoted elsewhere in patristic literature, and was a special favourite with the Gnostics; see Hilgenfeld, *Die apostol. Väter*, p. 102; Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche*, p. 267 sq.

Epiphanius, *Haer.* xlii. p. 372, ed. Petav. (Dindorf, ii. 388): "Διὸ λέγει, ἔγινε ὁ καθύδων καὶ ἀνάστα ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, καὶ ἐπιφαύσει σοὶ ὁ Χριστός" (Eph. v. 14). Πόθεν τῇ ἀποστόλῃ τὸ "διὸ καὶ λέγει," ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς παλαιᾶς

δῆλον διαθήκης; τούτο δὲ ἐμφέρεται παρὰ τῷ Ἑλίῳ. Hippolytus, *De Christo et Antichr.*, chap. lxn., quotes the same passage (Eph. v. 14) with the formula ὁ προφήτης λέγει, and with a slight deviation in regard to the terms (ἐξουσίῃ instead of ἀνδοῦ). It also occurs with the same deviation and with the formula ὁ γραφὴ λέγει in an utterance of the Naasenes quoted by Hippolytus (*Philosophum.* v. 7, p. 146, ed. Duncker). But both those quotations are undoubtedly to be traced simply to the Epistle to the Ephesians (Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra canonem receptum*, 2nd ed. iv. 74, thinks, though without any distinct ground for doing so, that they may have been taken from the Apocalypse of Peter). According to Euthalius, Eph. v. 14 formed part of an Apocryphum that bore the name of *Jeremiah* (Zaccagni, *Collectanea monumentorum veterum*, p. 561 = Gallandi, *Biblioth. patr.* x. 260). Similarly Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 48, and the above-mentioned anonymous list of Paul's quotations from the Scriptures, which simply reproduces Euthalius. We may safely venture to assume that this Apocryphum bearing the name of Jeremiah was itself of Christian origin.

The work by the Hellenist Eupolemus, *περὶ τῆς ἑλίου προφητείας* (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 30), has nothing to do with our Apocryphum. On this see sec. 33. Iar. Levi endeavours to make out the probable existence of a *Hebrew Apocalypse of Elijah* on the strength of two Talmudic passages (*Sanhedrin* 97b; *Joma* 19b), where certain utterances of Elijah regarding questions of Messianic dogma happen to be quoted (*Revue des études juives*, vol. i. 1880, p. 108 sqq.). On a passage of this sort from post-Talmudic times, see Jellinek, *Bet-ha-Midrash*, vol. iii.

Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 1070–1086. Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 2nd ed. p. 235 sq. Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 330 sq. Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 359. The commentaries on 1 Cor. ii. 9 and Eph. v. 14.

4. *The Apocalypse of Zephaniah.* Apart from the Stichometry of Nicephorus and the anonymous list of the Apocrypha (see p. 126), all we know of this writing is from a quotation in Clement of Alexandria.

Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 11. 77: Ἀρ' οὐχ ὅμοια ταῦτα τοῖς ὑπὸ Σοφορίᾳ λεχθεῖσι τοῦ προφήτου; “καὶ ἀνίστασθαι με πνεῦμα καὶ ἀνήμεγνέν με εἰς οὐρανὸν πέμπτον καὶ ἰδύμενον ἀγγέλους καλουμένους κυρίους, καὶ τὸ διάδημα αὐτῶν ἱκεῖσθαι ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ ἦν ἐκείνου αὐτῶν ὁ θρόνος ἐκπαπλάσιον φωτὸς ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος, οἰκουμένης ἐν νοσὶς σωτηρίας καὶ ὑμνοῦντας θεὸν ἀρρητῶν ὑψίστου.”

Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 1140 sq. Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xii. 360.

The Apocalypses we have just been considering are far from exhausting the number of them that were in circulation in the early Church. At the end of the Stichometry of Nicephorus mention is made of *ψευδεπίγραφα* of Baruch

Habakkuk, Ezekiel, and Daniel. As we have already stated, Euthalius was acquainted with an Apocryphum bearing the name of Jeremiah. Jerome mentions a Hebrew Apocryphum bearing this prophet's name in which Matt. xxvii. 9 occurred.³⁹ But as regards all these and many others besides, it is extremely doubtful, for various reasons, and chiefly from their appearing somewhat late in the Christian Church, whether they are of Jewish origin. It is obvious that the four last-mentioned pseudepigraphs are to be regarded as an addition at some subsequent period to the original Stichometry of Nicephorus.

VI. THE SACRED LEGENDS.

The authors of the pseudepigraphic prophecies had chiefly in view the practical aim of imparting greater weight to the lessons and exhortations which they desired to address to their contemporaries by ascribing them to the sacred authorities whose names they bear. Not only however did they represent the holy men of God themselves as speaking to posterity, but it was not uncommon at the same time to enrich the accounts we have *regarding those personages* with new material, partly for the purpose of giving to the present generation a clearer view of the sacred narrative generally by the addition of copious details, and partly by surrounding these saints of the olden time with a halo of glory, to hold them up more and more unreservedly as shining models for Israel to imitate (comp. in general, Div. ii. vol. i. p. 339 et seq.). Now there were two ways in which the things here in question, viz. the amplifying and embellishing of the sacred story and adapting it to purposes of edification, could be effected, either by a *continual modifying of the text of the Biblical narrative*, or by *singling*

³⁹ Jerome, *ad Matth.* xxvii. 9 (Vallarsi, vii. 1, 228) : Legi nuper in quodam Hebraico volumine, quod Nazaraenae sectae mihi Hebraeus obtulit, Jeremie apocryphum, in quo haec ad verbum scripta reperi.

out certain personages in it and making them the heroes of fictitious legends. At first it was the former of these courses that was chiefly followed, though afterwards the latter came more and more to be adopted as well. A classical example of each of those two modes of enriching the sacred story has come down to us from a comparatively early period, from somewhere about the time of Christ. The so-called *Book of Jubilees* is an instance of the way in which the text was modified, while in the *Martyrdom of Isaiah* we have a specimen of the fictitious legend. Other writings of this description are either known to us merely from quotations or have come down to us only in the shape of Christian versions of them. But a large amount of material of this sort is also to be found in writings the principal objects of which are different from those mentioned above. Legendary amplifications of the sacred narrative are also to be met with in almost all of the pseudepigraphic prophecies. This, as appears from what has been already said, is true above all of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs into which the biographical element enters so largely. And so for this reason it has also very many points of contact with the first of the two principal works which we will now proceed to consider.

1. *The Book of Jubilees.*

Didymus Alexandrinus, Epiphanius, and Jerome quote an apocryphal book under the title τὰ Ἰωβηλαία or ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις, from which they borrow various details connected with the history of the patriarchs. Then copious extracts from this same work are given by the Byzantine chroniclers Syncellus, Cedrenus, Zonaras, Glycas, from the beginning of the ninth down to the twelfth century. But at this latter point the book disappears, and for a long time it was looked upon as lost, till it turned up again in the present century in the Abyssinian Church, where it was found in an Ethiopic version. It was published for the first time by Dillmann in

a German translation (Ewald's *Jahrbücher*, ii.-iii. 1850-1851), and afterwards in the Ethiopic text (1859). Besides this Ethiopic version, a large fragment of the work is likewise extant in an old Latin version which in like manner was not discovered till modern times, the author of the discovery being Ceriani, who found it in a manuscript in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, and afterwards published it among the *Monumenta sacra et profana* (vol. i. fasc. 1, 1861). This Latin fragment was also subsequently edited by Rönisch, accompanied with a Latin rendering by Dillmann of the corresponding portion in the Ethiopic version, as well as a commentary and several excursuses full of valuable matter (1874).

The contents of the book are substantially the same as those of our canonical Genesis, for which reason it is also generally styled "*the smaller Genesis*," not because it is of smaller dimensions (on the contrary, it is larger than the other), but because it is inferior in point of authority to the canonical book. It stands to this latter very much in the same relation as a *Haggadean commentary* to the text of the Bible. At the same time it is as far as possible from being an actual exposition of the text, which in fact the Haggadean Midrash never pretends to be, but simply a *free reproduction of the early Biblical history from the creation of the world down to the institution of the Passover* (Ex. xii.), and that from the standpoint and in the spirit of later Judaism. The whole is made to assume the form of a revelation imparted to Moses on Mount Sinai by an "angel of the presence." The object of the author in selecting this form was to secure at once for the new matters which he has to communicate the same authority as was already accorded to the text of the Bible. In his reproduction he has paid special attention to the matter of chronology, the due fixing of this being without doubt one of the leading objects for which his book was written. He takes as the basis of reckoning the *jubilee-period* of 49 years, which again resolves itself into

seven year-weeks of seven years each, and then, in fixing the date of any event, he determines the exact month of the exact year of the exact year-week of the exact jubilee-period in which it occurred. From this it is not difficult to see why the whole book was called τὰ Ἰωβηλαία, "the Jubilees." As the author was interested in chronology generally, so he lays a peculiar stress upon the observance of the *annual festivals*, and endeavours to prove with regard to each of the leading feasts that it had been instituted in the very earliest times; so for example with regard to Pentecost or the feast of Weeks (Ewald's *Jahrbb.* ii. 245, iii. 8), the feast of Tabernacles (*Ibid.* iii. 11), the great Day of Atonement (iii. 46), and the feast of the Passover (iii. 68 sq.). This also serves to explain why it is that he happens to finish with the institution of the Passover (Ex. xii.).

As the author seeks to reproduce the history of primitive times *in the spirit of his own day*, he deals with the Biblical text in a very free fashion. Many things that did not happen to interest him, or that he considered objectionable, were either omitted or altered, while others were still further amplified by the addition of numerous particulars of one kind or another. He is always by way of showing exactly where the founders of the primitive families or races got their wives from; he explains how far Gen. ii. 17 had been literally fulfilled (comp. Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* chap. lxxxi.), with whose help Noah brought the animals into the ark, how the Hamitic family of the Canaanites and the Japhetic one of the Medes found their way within the sphere of the Semitic family, why Rebecca had such a decided preference for Jacob,⁴⁰ and so on. He is acquainted with the names of the wives of the whole of the patriarchs from Adam down to the twelve sons of Jacob, he knows the name of the particular peak of Mount Ararat on which Noah's ark rested, and many other things of a similar kind.⁴¹ All those embellishments and amplifications

⁴⁰ Dillmann in Ewald's *Jahrbb.* vol. iii. p. 78 sq.

⁴¹ *Ibid.* p. 80.

are entirely in the spirit of later Judaism. A peculiarly characteristic feature is the circumstance that the patriarchs are represented as paragons of moral excellence to even a greater extent than in the Biblical narrative itself, and as being already in the habit of observing the whole of the Mosaic ritual, of offering sacrifices and firstlings, and of celebrating the annual festivals, the new moons, and the Sabbaths. It is further characteristic, that everywhere the *hierarchia coelestis* is represented as forming the background of this world's history. The angels, good and evil alike, are regularly interfering with the course of human affairs, and inciting men to good and evil actions. We learn that the angels observed the law in heaven long before it was promulgated upon earth. For from the very beginning that law stood inscribed upon the heavenly tablets, and it was only by degrees that it was copied from these and communicated to men. It appears moreover that the whole of the divine teachings had not been openly published to the people of Israel, many of them having been communicated to the patriarchs only in secret books which were transmitted by them to later generations.

Notwithstanding its many salient features of a characteristic nature, it is still difficult to say amid what circles the book had its origin. Jellinek regards it as an Essenian work of an anti-Pharisaic tendency. But although a good many things in it, such as its highly developed angelology, its secret books, its doctrine of the continued existence of the soul without any resurrection of the body (iii. 24), seem to favour the hypothesis of an Essenian origin, yet there are others that but the more decisively preclude such a hypothesis. It says nothing about those washings and purifications that formed so important a feature of Essenism. It is true the author strongly reproaches the eating of blood, still he by no means expresses his disapproval of animal sacrifices as was so emphatically done by the Essenes. Still less are we to think of a Samaritan origin as Beer is disposed to do, for this hypothesis again is

precluded by the fact that the author speaks of the garden of Eden, the mount of the east, Mount Sinai, and Mount Zion as being "the four places of God upon earth" (ii. 241, 251), and thus excludes Gerizim from the number. Again, Frankel's view, that the book was written by a Hellenistic Jew belonging to Egypt, is no less untenable. For, as will be seen immediately, the language in which it was originally composed was not Greek but Hebrew. There cannot be a doubt that the greater number of the peculiarities by which this book is characterized are such as it has in common with the prevailing Pharisaism of the time. And one might refer it to this without further ado were it not that several difficulties stand in the way, such as its opposition to the mode of reckoning adopted in the Pharisaic calendar (ii. 246), and its doctrine of a continued existence of the soul apart from any resurrection (ii. 24). But it would be absolutely erroneous again if, in consequence of these facts, and because of the decided prominence given to the tribe of Levi (iii. 39 sq.), we were to suppose that a Sadducee was the author of our work, for its elaborate angelology and its doctrine of immortality are of themselves sufficient to render such a supposition impossible. The truth of the matter would rather seem to be this, that the author, while of course *representing in all essential respects the standpoint of the dominant Pharisaism of his time*, gives expression to his own personal views only in connection with one or two particulars here and there (so also for example Dillmann, Rönsch, Drummond).

That the book had its origin in Palestine is already evidenced by the fact that it was *written originally in Hebrew*. For although the Ethiopic and the Latin versions have been taken from the Greek, this does not alter the fact that the original was composed in Hebrew, as is evident from explicit statements to this effect made by Jerome. The *date of the composition* of our work may be determined, if not within very narrow limits, yet with an approximate degree of certainty. For we find, on the one hand, that our author undoubtedly makes use

of, nay that he actually quotes the Book of Enoch. Then it is extremely probable, on the other, that the author of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* had our book before him when he wrote. In addition to this there is the further circumstance that we nowhere find any reference whatever to the destruction of Jerusalem; on the contrary, it is assumed throughout to be still standing as the central place of worship (comp. above all, iii. 42, 69). From all this we may venture, with tolerable probability, to refer the composition of our work to the first century of our era.

On the various titles of the book, see Rösensch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 461-482. Besides those mentioned above, we also find in Syncellus and Cedrenus the title ἀποκάλυψις Μωυσίου (Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 5 and 49; Cedrenus, ed. Bekker, i. 9).

The Ethiopic and Latin versions are both based upon a Greek text, on the former of which see Dillmann in Ewald's *Jahrbb.* iii. 88 sq., and on the latter, Rösensch, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1871, pp. 86-89. Idem, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 439-444. But, according to Jerome, we must assume that the original text was in Hebrew. It may be conjectured that the Greek version would be prepared only at a comparatively late date, say in the third century A.D., which would serve to explain how it happened that the book did not come into use in the Christian Church till the fourth century A.D.

It is obvious that in our work a liberal use is made of the Book of Enoch, nay in one passage (Ewald's *Jahrbb.* ii. 240) it is said of Enoch that: "He wrote in a book the signs of heaven in the order of their months, in order that the children of men might know the seasons of the years according to the order of the various months. . . . He saw in his dream the past and the future, what was going to happen to the sons of the children of men in their generations one after another down to the day of judgment. All this he saw and knew and wrote it down as a testimony, and left it on the earth as a testimony for all the sons of the children of men and for their generations." This and all that is said elsewhere regarding Enoch agrees entirely with the contents of our Book of Enoch. See in general, Dillmann in Ewald's *Jahrbb.* iii. 90 sq. Rösensch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 408-412.

On the allusions to our book in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, see p. 122. The quotations found in the Fathers and the Byzantine writers are collected by Fabricius in his *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 849-864, ii. 120 sq. Rösensch, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1871, p. 69 sq. Idem, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 250-382.

Didymus Alex., *In epist. canonicas enarrationes*, ad 1 John iii. 12 (Gallandi, *Biblioth. patr.* vi. 300): Nam et in libro qui leprogenensis [l.

leptogenesis] appellatur, ita legitur, quia Cain lapide aut ligno percusserit Abel (to which quotation Langen has drawn attention in the *Bonner Theol. Literaturbl.* 1874, p. 270).

Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxxix. 6: 'Ὡς δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἰωβηλαίοις εὐρίσκεται, τῇ καὶ λεπτῇ Γένεσι καλουμένη, καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν γυναικῶν τοῦ τε Καὶν καὶ τοῦ Σὴθ ἢ βίβλος περιέχει κ.τ.λ.

Jerome, *Epist.* 78 ad Fabiolam, *Mansio* 18 (Vallarsi, i. 483), speaking of the name of a place called *Ressa* (ῤῥῤ, Num. xxxiii. 21), observes: Hoc verbum quantum memoria suggerit nusquam alibi in scripturis sanctis apud Hebraeos invenisse me novi absque libro apocrypho qui a Graecis λεπτὴ id est parva Genesis appellatur; ibi in aedificatione turris pro stadio ponitur, in quo exercentur pugiles et athletae et cursorum velocitas comprobatur. *Ibid.* *Mansio* 24 (Vallarsi, i. 485), speaking again of the name of a place called *Thare* (ῤῥῤ, Num. xxxiii. 27), observes: Hoc eodem vocabulo et iisdem literis scriptum invenio patrem Abraham, qui in supradicto apocrypho Geneseos volumine, abactis corvis, qui hominum frumenta vastabant, abactoris vel depulsoris sortitus est nomen.

In the *Decretum Gelasii* we find included among the Apocrypha a work entitled *Liber de filiabus Adae Leptogenesis* (see Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 218. Rönsch, pp. 270 sq., 477 sq.). It may be conjectured that here we have an erroneous combination of two titles belonging to two separate works. However, we can see from this as well as from the circumstance of their being a Latin version of it, that the book was also known in the West. On the indications of its having been made use of by occidental writers, see Rönsch, pp. 322–382 *passim*.

Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 5: ὡς ἐν λεπτῇ φέρεται Γένεσι, ἣν καὶ Μωϋσῆως εἶναι φασὶ τινες ἀποκάλυψιν. i. 7: ἐκ τῆς λεπτῆς Γενέσεως. i. 13: ἐκ τῶν λεπτῶν Γενέσεως. i. 49: ἐν τῇ Μωϋσῆως λεγομένῃ ἀποκάλυψιν. i. 183: ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις φησιν. i. 185: ὡς ἐν λεπτῇ καίται Γένεσι. i. 192: ὡς φησιν ἡ λεπτὴ Γένεσις. i. 203: ἐν λεπτῇ Γένεσι φέρεται.

Cedrenus, ed. Bekker, i. 6: καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς λεπτῆς Γενέσεως. i. 9: ὡς ἐν λεπτῇ φέρεται Γένεσι, ἣν καὶ Μωϋσῆως εἶναι φασὶ τινες ἀποκάλυψιν. i. 16: ὡς ἡ λεπτὴ Μωϋσῆως Γένεσις φησιν. i. 48: ὡς ἐπὶ τῇ λεπτῇ καίται Γένεσι. i. 58: ἐν τῇ λεπτῇ Γένεσι καίται. i. 85: ἐν τῇ λεπτῇ Γένεσι καίται.

Zonaras, ed. Pinder (given in common with the two foregoing in the Bonn edition of the *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae*), vol. i. p. 18: ἐν τῇ λεπτῇ Γένεσι.

Glycas, ed. Bekker (also given in the Bonn collection), p. 198: ἡ λεγομένη λεπτὴ Γένεσις. P. 206: ἡ δὲ λεπτὴ Γένεσις λέγει. P. 392: ἡ δὲ λεγομένη λεπτὴ Γένεσις, οὐκ οὔδ' ἔστιν συγγραφέα καὶ ὅπως, φησί.

The literature of our book is enumerated and considered at some length by Rönsch in *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, pp. 422–439.

Texts: Kufälé sive *Liber Jubilaeorum*, aethiopice ad duorum libror. manuscr. fidem primum, ed. Dillmann, Kiel 1859. Dillmann, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis, aus dem Aethiopischen übersetzt* (Ewald's *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* vol. ii. 1850, pp. 230–256; vol. iii. 1851, pp. 1–96). Ceriani, *Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. i. fasc. 1 (1861), pp. 15–54. Rönsch, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis, unter*

Beifügungen des revidirten Textes der in der Ambrosiana aufgefundenen lateinischen Fragmente, etc. etc., erläutert untersucht und herausgegeben, Leipzig 1874.

Special disquisitions: Treuenfels, *Die kleine Genesis* (Fürst's *Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1846, Nos. 1-6; comp. vol. for 1851, No. 15), which was written before the Ethiopic text was discovered. Jellinek, *Ueber das Buch der Jubiläen und das Noach-Buch*, Leipzig 1855 (reprinted from part 3 of the *Bet ha-Midrash*). Beer, *Das Buch der Jubiläen und sein Verhältniss zu den Midraschim*, Leipzig 1856. Idem, *Noch ein Wort über das Buch der Jubiläen*, Leipzig 1857. Frankel, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums*, 1856, pp. 311-316, 380-400. Dillmann, *Zeitschr. der deutschen morgenländ. Gesellsch.* xi. 1857, pp. 161-163. Krüger, "Die Chronologie im Buch der Jubiläen" (*Zeitschr. der DMG.* vol. xii. 1858, pp. 279-299). Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 84-102. Rubin, *Das Buch der Jubiläen oder die kleine Genesis in's Hebräische übersetzt, mit einer Einleitung und mit Noten versehen*, Wien, Beck's Univ.-Buchhandlung, 1870. Ginsburg, art. "Jubilee, Book of," in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*. Rönsch, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1871, pp. 60-98. Idem, *Das Buch der Jubiläen*, Leipzig 1874. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1874, pp. 435-441. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah* (1877), pp. 143-147. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A.T.'s*, § 571. Dillmann, *Beiträge aus dem Buch der Jubiläen zur Kritik des Pentateuch-Textes* (*Transactions of the Berlin Academy*, 1883, pp. 323-340). Idem, in *Herzog's Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 364 sq.

2. The Martyrdom of Isaiah.

An apocryphal work containing an account of the martyrdom of Isaiah is repeatedly mentioned by Origen. He simply calls it an *ἀπόκρυφον*, tells us nothing of its contents beyond the statement that Isaiah had been sawn asunder, and plainly describes it as a *Jewish* production. Again in the *Constitutiones apostol.* reference is made merely in a general way to an Apocryphum *Ἰσαίου*. On the other hand, in the list of the canon edited by Montfaucon, Pitra, and others there is a more precise mention of a *Ἰσαίου δρασις* (see p. 127). Epiphanius knows of *τὸ ἀναβατικὸν Ἰσαίου*, which was in use among the Archontics and the Hieracites. Jerome speaks of an *Ascensio Isaiae*. It is extremely probable that these references are not all to one and the same work, that, on the contrary, Origen had in view a purely Jewish production, while the others referred to a Christian version of it, or to

some Christian work quite independent of it. For there exists a Christian Apocryphum on Isaiah which, at all events, is made up of a variety of elements, though the oldest of them may be pretty clearly seen to be a Jewish *history of the martyrdom of Isaiah*. This Apocryphum, like so many others, has come down to us in its entirety only in an Ethiopic version, and was published for the first time by Laurence (1819). The second half of it is likewise extant in an old Latin version, which was printed at Venice in 1522, but had long disappeared until it was brought to light again by Gieseler (1832). This whole material, accompanied with valuable disquisitions and elucidations, has been embodied in Dillmann's edition (*Ascensio Isaiae*, Lips. 1877). Lastly, Gebhardt published (1878) a Greek text, which however does not profess to be the original book, but an adaptation of it in the shape of a Christian legend of the saints.

The contents of the whole work, as given in the Ethiopic text, are as follows: *First part*: the martyrdom (chaps. i.-v.). Isaiah intimates to Hezekiah the future impiety of his son Manasseh (chap. i.). After Hezekiah's death, Manasseh, as had been foretold, abandons himself entirely to the service of Satan, in consequence of which Isaiah and those of his way of thinking retire into solitude (chap. ii.). Thereupon a certain person called Balkirah complains to King Manasseh that Isaiah had been uttering prophecies against the king and the people (chap. iii. 1-12). As for Balkirah, he had been incited to this hostility to Isaiah by Satan (Berial), who was angry at the former because he had predicted the coming redemption by Christ. Here the writer takes occasion to recount the whole history of Jesus and His Church as it had been foretold by Isaiah, and that from Christ's incarnation down to the Neronian persecution (chap. iv. 2) and the last judgment (iii. 13-iv. *fin.*). In deference to the clamours for the punishment of the prophet, Manasseh orders him to be sawn asunder, a martyr death which he bears with singular firmness (chap. v.). *Second part*: the

vision (chaps. vi.-xi.). In the twentieth year of Hezekiah's reign Isaiah sees the following vision, which he communicates to King Hezekiah and to Josab his own (the prophet's) son (chap. vi.). An angel conducts the prophet first of all through the firmament and throughout the whole six lower heavens, and shows him all that was to be seen in each of them (chaps. vii. viii.). At last they reach the seventh heaven, where Isaiah sees all the righteous that have died from Adam downwards, and then he sees God the Lord Himself (chap. ix.). After having heard God the Father giving to his Son Jesus Christ His commission to descend into the world, Isaiah comes back again to the firmament accompanied by the angel (chap. x.). Here there is revealed to him the future birth of Jesus Christ and the history of His life upon earth down to His crucifixion and resurrection, whereupon the angel returns to the seventh heaven, while Isaiah goes back to his earthly body (chap. xi.).

This outline of the contents of our book will suffice to show that here we have to do with two elements of a totally distinct and dissimilar nature. There is no connection whatever between the vision and the martyrdom. Not only so, the vision is with singular awkwardness made to follow the martyrdom which, in the order of time, it should of course have preceded. Nor does the martyrdom again form one connected whole. Above all is the whole passage iii. 13 - v. 1, which interrupts and disturbs the connection, obviously to be regarded as a later interpolation, as is also the kindred passage in the second part, xi. 2-22. And lastly, the introduction again has only an apparent connection with what follows. On closer examination we find reason to suspect that in all probability that introduction was inserted at some subsequent period. On the strength of these facts Dillmann has propounded the following hypotheses regarding the origin of our book. In the first place we are to distinguish two elements that are independent of each other. (1) The account of the martyrdom of Isaiah, chaps. ii. 1-iii. 12, and v. 2-14, which is of Jewish

origin; and (2) the vision of Isaiah, chaps. vi.-xi. (exclusive of xi. 2-22), which is of Christian origin. Then we are to regard these two elements (3) as having been amalgamated by a Christian who at the same time composed and inserted the introduction (chap. i.). Lastly, when the work had assumed this shape, another Christian would afterwards insert the two sections (chaps. iii. 13-v. 1, and xi. 2-22). These conjectures may at least be regarded as extremely probable. They are borne out not only by the internal indications already referred to, but by external testimony as well. In the free version of the whole book edited by Gebhardt no trace is to be met with of sections iii. 13-v. 1 and xi. 2-22. Besides this latter section (xi. 2-22) does not occur in the Latin version, which, as has been previously observed, embraces only chaps. vi.-xi. It is evident therefore that the sections in question must be later interpolations. But the circumstance that the vision and the vision alone is all that has come down to us in the Latin version, goes to confirm the assumption that this vision of itself originally formed an independent whole. By the *ᾠρασις*, the *ἀναβατικόν*, *ascensio Isaiae* mentioned by the Fathers, we have therefore to understand merely that visionary journey of Isaiah through the seven heavens which had been composed by some Christian or another. In the case of Origen however it is the Jewish account of the *martyrdom* of Isaiah (chaps. ii. 1-iii. 12 and v. 2-14) that is in view. This latter is simply a legendary story composed for the purpose of glorifying the prophet. It contains nothing of an apocalyptic character, and consequently does not belong to the category of prophetic pseudepigraphs, but to that of legendary works.

The story of the *sawing asunder of Isaiah* is mentioned by writers of so early a date as Justin Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* chap. cxx.; Tertullian, *De patientia*, chap. xiv.; *Scorpiace*, chap. viii. (comp. Div. ii. vol. i. p. 345). It is probably this too that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has in view in chap. xi. 37. In so far as it is probable that the reference here is to our book, so far have we at the same time a clue to the date of the composition of that Epistle.

Origen, *Epist. ad Africanum*, chap. ix. (de la Rue, i. 19 sq.; Lommatzsch,

xvii. 51). With the view of proving that the Jewish authorities had suppressed everything that represented them in an unfavourable light, some specimens of which have nevertheless come down to us in apocryphal writings (*ὡς τινα εὑρίσκειται ἐν ἀποκρύφους*), Origen proceeds as follows: *Καὶ τοῦτον παραδειγμα δώσωμεν τὰ περὶ τὸν Ἡσαΐαν ἱστορούμενα, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς μαρτυρούμενα, ἐν οὐδενὶ τῶν Φανερῶν βιβλίων γεγραμμένα* (here follows the quotation Heb. xi. 37). . . . *Σαφές δ' ὅτι αἱ παραδόσεις λέγουσι πεπρίσθαι Ἡσαΐαν τὸν προφῆτην καὶ ἐν τινὶ ἀποκρύφῳ τοῦτο εἴρεται ὅπερ τάχα ἐπίτηδες ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων βραδύδουρῳ γκαί, λήξιν τινας τὰς μὴ περιούσιας παρεμβολακτῶν τῇ γραφῇ, ἵν' ἡ ὅλη ἀπιστηθῇ.*

Origen, *Ad Matth.* xiii. 57 (de la Rue, iii. 465; Lommatzsch, iii. 49): *Καὶ Ἡσαΐας δὲ πεπρίσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ ἱστορεῖται· εἰ δὲ τις οὐ προσέτιται τὴν ἱστορίαν διὰ τὸ ἐν τῷ ἀποκρύφῳ Ἡσαΐα αὐτὴν εἴρεσθαι, πιστευσάτω τοῖς ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους αὐτῷ γεγραμμένοις* (Heb. xi. 37).

Origen, *Ad Matth.* xiii. 57 (de la Rue, iii. 848; Lommatzsch, iv. 237 sq.): *Propterea videndum, non forte oporteat ex libris secretioribus, qui apud Judaeos feruntur, ostendere verbum Christi et non solum Christi, sed etiam discipulorum ejus. . . . Fertur ergo in scripturis non manifestis serratum esse Jesaiam, etc.*

Origen, *In Jesaiam homil.* i. 5 (de la Rue, 108; Lommatzsch, xiii. 245 sq.): *Ajunt [Judaei] ideo Isaiam esse sectum a populo quasi legem praevaricantem et extra scripturas annuntiantem. Scriptura enim dicit: "nemo videbit faciem meam et vivet." Iste vero ait: "vidi Dominum Sabaoth." Moses, ajunt, non vidit et tu vidisti? Et propter hoc eum secuerunt et condemnaverunt eum ut impium. And this is precisely as the affair is represented in our book, chap. iii. 8 sqq.*

Epiphanius, *Haer.* xl. 2 (speaking of the Archontics): *λαμβάνουσι δὲ λάβας ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναβατικικοῦ Ἡσαΐα, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἄλλων τινῶν ἀποκρύφων. Idem, Haer.* lxxvii. 3: *βούλεται δὲ [scil. Hierakas] τὴν τιμὴν αὐτοῦ εὐσεβῶς ποιῆσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀναβατικικοῦ Ἡσαΐου, δῆθεν ὡς ἐν τῷ ἀναβατικῷ λεγόμενῳ ἔστιν ἱκεῖς* (here follows a quotation which substantially coincides with a passage in chap. ix. of our book).

Jerome, *Comm. in Isaiam*, chap. lxiv. 3 [*al.* lxiv. 4] (Vallarsi, iv. 761): *Ascensio enim Isaiæ et apocalypsis Eliae hoc habent testimonium, namely, the passage 1 Cor. ii. 9. With regard to the Apocalypsis Eliae, see p. 129. The passage actually occurs in the Latin text of the Ascensio Isaiæ. It is wanting, however, in the Ethiopic, and so is obviously an interpolation.*

Jerome, *Comm. in Isaiam*, chap. lvii. *fin.* (Vallarsi, iv. 666): *Judaei . . . arbitrantur . . . Isaiam de sua prophetare morte quod serrandus sit a Manasse serra lignes, quae apud eos certissima traditio est.*

On the patristic quotations, comp. also Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 1086-1100.

The *Ethiopic text* was published by Laurence, accompanied with a Latin and English version (*Ascensio Isaiæ vatis, opusculum pseudepigraphum, cum versione Latina Anglicanaque publici juris factum*, Oxoniae 1819). Mai (*Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, vol. iii. 2, 1828, p. 238 sq.) published two fragments of an old Latin version, viz. chaps. ii. 14-iii. 18 and vii. 1-19, without being aware that they formed part of our Apocryphum. After

Niebuhr had discovered the source from which they came they were fully discussed by Nitzsch (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, p. 209 sqq.). The old Latin version of the *Visio* (chaps. vi.-xi. of the Ethiopic text), which had been printed at Venice in 1522, and had then disappeared for a long time, was found again and reprinted by Gieseler in a Göttingen program (*Vetus translatio latina visionis Jesaiae*, etc., Götting. 1832). The Latin version of Laurence, accompanied with the old Latin texts, was also reprinted by Gfrörer, *Prophetas veteres pseudepigraphi*, Stuttg. 1840. A German version of those texts was published by Jolowicz (*Die Himmelfahrt und Vision des Propheten Jesaja, aus dem Aethiopischen* [or as it should rather have been? *aus Laurence's lateinischer Uebersetzung*] und *Lateinischen in's Deutsche übersetzt*, Leipzig 1854). A critical edition of the Ethiopic text, along with an amended translation, and containing also the old Latin versions, was issued by Dillmann (*Ascensio Isaiae, Aethiopice et Latine cum prolegomenis, adnotationibus criticis et exegeticis, additis versionum Latinarum reliquiis edita*, Lips. 1877). Gebhardt published a Greek text, in which we have a free version of the whole book, framed in the style of the later Christian legends of the saints (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1878, pp. 330-353).

Special disquisitions: Gesenius, *Commentar über den Jesaja*, vol. i. 1821, p. 45 sqq. Nitzsch, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1830, pp. 209-246. Gieseler, *Göttinger Progr.* 1832 (see above). Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, 1838, i. p. 65 sqq. A. G. Hoffmann, art. "Jesajas," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allg. Encycl.* sec. ii. vol. xv. (1838) pp. 387-390. Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 2nd ed. 1852, pp. 274-302. Bleek, *Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, pp. 994-998. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments*, sec. 274. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vii. 369-373. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 157-167. Dillmann in his edition (1877). Idem, in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vol. xii. 359 sq. Renan, *L'église chrétienne* 1879, p. 528 sq.

3. *The Lost Legendary Works.*

In a manner similar to that which we have just seen exemplified in the case of Isaiah, pretty nearly the whole of the prominent personages belonging to the hallowed days of old were laid hold of by the legendary spirit for the purpose of throwing around them a halo of glory. The plain narratives of Holy Scripture were far too simple and unadorned to satisfy the tastes and the needs of later times. A desire was manifested to know more about those men, above all to know something regarding them of a more piquant and edifying character than was furnished by the canonical records. Accordingly we find that it is the lives of the three great heroes, Adam the progenitor of the human race, Abraham the father of Israel, and Moses

the great lawgiver, that have been most elaborately embellished by fictitious legends. And there are many other men of God besides whose lives have been subjected to a similar treatment (comp. in general vol. i. Div. ii. p. 341 et seq.). Then *Christians* have laid hold of the existing *Jewish* legends, and elaborated them with equal, nay if possible with greater zeal. Consequently, as in the case of the Apocalypses so also here, we often find it impossible to distinguish with any certainty between what is Jewish and what is Christian. The foundations of the legends themselves are in most cases undoubtedly Jewish. But it is not improbable that the earliest *writings* of this class are also to be ascribed to Jewish authors. This holds true above all of the three great founders of new epochs, Adam, Abraham and Moses, to whom therefore we will here confine ourselves.

1. *Books of Adam.* A variety of tolerably voluminous *Christian* works on the life of Adam have come down to us, an Ethiopic one, a Syriac one, another in Syriac and Arabic, one in Greek, and another in Latin. Although the whole of these are unquestionably of Christian origin, and although there is not one of them that can be regarded as based upon a Jewish original, still it is probable that they have drawn upon Jewish material. A *Jewish Book of Adam* is mentioned in the Talmud. The *Constitutiones apostol.* vi. 16 mention an apocryphal Ἀδάμ along with the Apocrypha bearing the names of Moses, Enoch and Isaiah. Again, in the list of the Apocrypha published by Montfaucon, Pitra and others, Ἀδάμ finds a place among the rest of the Jewish Apocrypha (see p. 126). Indeed at an early period there already existed Gnostic ἀποκαλύψεις τοῦ Ἀδάμ (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxvi. 8). In the *Decretum Gelasii* there occurs a Liber, qui appellatur Poenitentia Adae (Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 219).

Editions of the Christian books of Adam: (1) Dillmann published a German translation of an *Ethiopic Book of Adam* (Ewald's *Jabrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* vol. v. 1853, pp. 1-144). The Ethiopic text was published

by Trumpp (*Transactions of the Akademie der Wissensch. of München*, philosopho-philol. department, vol. xv. 1879-1881), and an English version by Malan (*Book of Adam and Eve, also called the Conflict of Adam and Eve with Satan, translated from the Ethiopic*, London 1882). (2) Akin to the above and, if we are to believe Dillmann, possessing a greater claim to originality, is a Syriac work, entitled "the treasure hole" (i.e. the hole in which the treasures of Paradise were kept), which as yet is known only through a German version published by Bezold (*Die Schatzhöhle, aus dem syr. Texte dreier unedirter Handschriften in's Deutsche übersetzt*, Leipzig 1883). (3) Another Syriac and Arabic work entitled, "The Testament of Adam," has been published by Renan, in the Syriac text accompanied with a French translation (*Journal asiatique*, fifth series, vol. ii. 1853, pp. 427-71). (4) Tischendorf published a Greek Book of Adam under the title *Apocalypsis Moisi* (*Apocalypses apocryphae*, Lips. 1866), and which was also published by Ceriani (*Monum. sacra et prof.* v. 1). On this comp. p. 81. (5) Nearly allied to this Greek work, in fact to some extent identical with it, is the Latin *Vita Adae et Evae*, published by Wilh. Meyer (*Transactions of the München Academy*, philo.-philol. department, vol. xiv. 1878).

Comp. in general Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 1-94, ii. 1-43. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, 1832, p. 128 sq. (the Rabbinical quotations here). Dukes in Fürst's *Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1849, coll. 76-78. Comp. also *ibid.* 1850, pp. 705 sqq., 732 sqq. Lücke, *Einkl. in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 2nd ed. p. 232. Hort, art. "Adam, Books of," in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, vol. i. 1877, pp. 84-89. Renan, *L'église chrétienne* (1879), p. 529 sq. Dillmann in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xii. 366 sq.

2. *Abraham*. A short apocryphal book of Ἀβραάμ (consisting of 300 verses) occurs in the Stichometry of Nicephorus and the *Synopsis Athanasii* (see p. 125). And as in these lists it is found in the very heart of the Jewish Apocrypha, it is of course a different book from that of the ἀποκάλυψις Ἀβραάμ which was in use among the Sethites (Epiphanius, *Haer.* xxxix. 5). On the other hand, it is no doubt the former of these that Origen has in view in the case of those statements regarding Abraham which he borrows from a certain apocryphal work.

Origen, *In Lucam homil.* xxxv. init. (de la Rue, iii. 973; Lommatzsch, v. 217): Legimus, si tamen cui placet hnjuscemodi scripturam recipere, justitiae et iniquitatis angelos super Abrahami salute et interitu disceptantes dum utraeque turmae suo eum volunt costui vendicare.

Comp. also Lücke, *Einkl. in die Offenb. Joh.* p. 232; and for the Abrahamic legend generally, see vol. i. Div. ii. p. 343; and Fabricius, *Cod.*

pseudepigr. i. pp. 341–428, ii. p. 81 sq. B. Beer, *Leben Abrahams nach Auffassung der jüdischen Sage*, Leipzig 1859.

3. *Moses and his time.* The apocryphal literature regarding Moses himself has been already considered at p. 80. But among the books referring both to himself and his time there is still another work to be mentioned, the theme of which was a single episode in the lawgiver's life, we mean the Book of *Jannes and Jambres*, the two Egyptian magicians who, according to Ex. vii. 8 sqq., wrought miracles before Pharaoh equal to those of Moses and Aaron, but were nevertheless beaten in the end. The names are not mentioned in the Old Testament, but they occur at a comparatively early date in the legends, and they were known not only in Jewish, but in Gentile and Christian circles as well, as the names of the two famous Egyptian magicians in question. The orthography fluctuates exceedingly. In the Greek texts the prevailing spelling is *Ἰαννης καὶ Ἰαμβρής*, as in the Targum of Jonathan it is יַנִּים וַמְבְּרִים. In the Talmud, on the other hand, we find יֹחָנָן וַמְרֵי (Jochane and Mamre), while in the Latin texts the names are almost uniformly spelt Jannes (or Jamnes) et Mambres. What the original spelling was it is difficult to determine. In any case the names appear to be of Semitic origin (see Steiner in Schenkel's *Bibell.* iii. 189; Riehm's *Wörterb.* p. 665 sq.; Orelli in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* vi. 478 sq.). The book written about the magicians in question is mentioned by Origen, and in the *Decretum Gelasii*. As the name of Jannes was known even to so early a writer as Pliny, and as it is probable that those anonymous personages owed their name and individuality first of all to the apocryphal book itself, we may perhaps venture to refer the date of the composition of this work to pre-Christian times.

For the Rabbinical passages referring to Jannes and Jambres, see Buxtorf's *Lex. Chald.* col. 945–947. Schoettgen, *Horae hebr.* note on 2 Tim. iii. 8. Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* note on same passage. Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* i. 337. Idem, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* ii. 226. The form יֹחָנָן וַמְרֵי is found in *Menachoth* lxxxv.^a; יַנִּים וַמְבְּרִים in the *Targum of Jonathan* on Ex. i. 15,

vii. 11; Num. xxii. 22; and also יִנּוֹס וְיִמְבְּרוֹס (Jonos and Jombros) in the *Tanachuma* and *Sohar*.

Of heathen writers Pliny and Apuleius are acquainted with Jannes, while the neo-Platonist Numenius knows both Jannes and Jambres. (1) Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xxx. 1. 11: Est et alia magices factio a Mose et Janne et Lotape ac Judaeis pendens, sed multis milibus annorum post Zoroastren. (2) Apuleius, *Apolog.* (or *De magia*) chap. xc. ed. Hildebrand: Ego ille sim Carinondas vel Damigeron vel is Moses vel Jannes vel Apollonius vel ipse Dardanus, vel quicumque alius post Zoroastren et Hostanen inter magos celebratus est. (3) Numenius in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* ix. 8: Τὰ δ' ἐξῆς 'Ιαννῆς καὶ 'Ιαμβρῆς Αἰγύπτιοι λογογράμματις, ἄνδρες οὐδένας ἤτους μαγεύσαι κριθέντες εἶναι, ἐπὶ 'Ιουδαίων ἐξελαννομένων ἐξ Αἰγύπτου. Μουσαίῳ γοῦν τῷ 'Ιουδαίων ἐξηγηταμίῳ, ἀνδρὶ γινομένῳ διψῶν εὐξασθαι δυνατάτα, οἱ παρὰστῆναι ἀξιωθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τοῦ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων οὔτοι ἦσαν, τὰν τε συμφορῶν ἃς ὁ Μουσαῖος ἐπέγε τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, τὰς ναιμικατάς αὐτῶν ἐκλιύσθαι ἔφθασαν δυνατοί. In view of this passage Origen, *Contra Celsum*, iv. 51, says with regard to Numenius that: 'Ἐκτίθεται καὶ τὴν περὶ Μουσαίου καὶ 'Ιαννοῦ καὶ 'Ιαμβροῦ ἱστορίαν. Owing to the circumstance that the term *Μουσαῖος*, which is here used for Moses, is precisely the same as that employed by the Hellenist Artapan, Freudenthal (*Alexander Polyhistor*. 1875, p. 173) is disposed to think that the story is borrowed from Artapan, and that he is the author of the legend. But this argument however cannot be regarded as conclusive. Then the names of the magicians, which in all probability are Semitic, seem rather to point to a Palestinian origin.

Then passing within the pale of Christianity the passage that first claims attention is 2 Tim. iii. 8: ὃν τρέπον δὲ 'Ιαννῆς καὶ 'Ιαμβρῆς ἀρτίστους Μωϋσῇ. Further, among Greek authors we may mention *Evang. Nicodemi* (= *Acta Pilati*), chap. v.; *Constitut. apostol.* viii. 1, and subsequent Fathers; but above all the hagiologist Palladius, who relates in his *Historia Lausiaca* (written about 420 A.D., see Fabricius-Harles, *Bibl. graec.* x. 98 sqq.) that Macarius visited the *κηποτάφιον*, which Jannes and Jambres had erected for themselves, and that he had an interview with the demons that had their abode there (see the passage in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* ii. 106-111). Latin writers: The Latin text of the *Evang. Nicodemi* (= *Gesta Pilati*), chap. v.; *Abdiae hist. apostol.* vi. 15 (in Fabricius, *Cod. apocr. Nov. Test.* i. 622). Cyprian, *De unitate ecclesiae*, chap. xvi. The Latin translator of Origen in the passages to be quoted below. The *Decretum Gelasii* (in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanon's*, p. 220) and subsequent Fathers. The Latin writers as well as the Western authorities for the text of 2 Tim. iii. 8 (*Cod. FG* and the text of the Itala) read Jannes (or Jannea) et Mambres almost uniformly. See the various readings in connection with 2 Tim. iii. 8 in the critical editions of the New Testament; also Thilo, *Cod. apocr. Nov. Test.* p. 553, and the earlier literature given there. As the Talmud adopts the spelling מִמְבְּרוֹס, Westcott and Hort are warranted in observing, as they do in the note on 2 Tim. iii. 8 in their edition of the New Testament, that "the Western text probably derived Μαμβρῆς from a Palestinian source."

The Book of Jannes and Jambres (or Mambres) is mentioned: (1) By

Origen, *Ad Matth.* xxvii. 9 (de la Rue, iii. 916; Lommatzsch, v. 29): Quod ait, "sicut Jannes et Mambres restiterunt Mosi" non invenitur in publicis scripturis, sed in libro secreto, qui superscribitur: Jannes et Mambres liber. (2) Again Origen, *Ad Matth.* xxiii. 37 (de la Rue, iii. 848; Lommatzsch, iv. 239), quotes 2 Tim. iii. 8: "sicut Jannes et Mambres restiterunt Mosi sic et isti resistunt veritati," as evidence that apocryphal writings are sometimes referred to in the New Testament. Nec enim scimus in libris canonicis historiam de Janne et Mambre resistantibus Mosi. (3) It is also mentioned in the *Decretum Gelatii* (in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 220): Liber, qui appellatur Poenitentia Jamnis et Mambre, apocryphus.

Comp. in general: Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 813-825, ii. 105-111. Suicer, *Thesaurus*, under 'Ιαννης. Wolf, *Curæ philol. in Nov. Test.* note on 2 Tim. iii. 8; and the commentaries generally on this passage. J. G. Michaelis, *De Janne et Jambre famosis Aegyptiorum magis*, Hal. 1747. The lexicons to the New Testament and the Bible Dictionaries of Winer, Schenkel, and Riehm. Rud. Hofmann, *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen* (1851), p. 352 sq. Orelli in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vi. 478 sq. Dillmann, *ibid.* xii. 365. Holtzmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (1880), p. 140 sq. Heath in *Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement* 1881, pp. 311-317.

Whatever other works based on Biblical legends were in use in the early Church are either entirely unknown to us (such for example as the Book of *Δάμειχ*, quoted in the list of the Apocrypha edited by Montfaucon and Pitra, see p. 126), or they may, without hesitation, be regarded as Christian productions, as for instance the history of Noria the wife of Noah (Epiph. *Haer.* xxvi. 1), or the ἀναβαθμοὶ Ἰακώβου (Epiph. *Haer.* xxx. 16), or the history of Asenath the wife of Joseph (according to Gen. xli. 45), which are still extant in various texts. What the Jewish substratum may have been in those instances it is impossible to make out with any degree of certainty, although there can scarcely be a doubt that Jewish *Books of Noah* for example were once to be met with. For further information regarding this whole literature, consult Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.*, and Dillmann, art. "Pseudepigraphen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*

VII. BOOKS OF MAGIC AND MAGICAL SPELLS.

By way of appendix to the above we may here mention further a class of literary productions which lie on the

extreme confines of *Jewish* literature, and which serve to show that the superstition that had sprung from the soil of the heathen nature-religions also continued to flourish with no little vigour among the people of Israel: we refer to the books of magic and magic spells. In the ancient world these represented the popular *arts of healing*. As even in our own day Christians are often met with who prefer the quack doctor to the skilled physician, so in the ancient world, at least in that part of it that was under the influence of the East, there was often a tendency to have recourse to the *magician* and the *exorcist* rather than to the regular doctor in every sort of ailment. It is interesting in this connection to hear for example what Celsus says about the Egyptians (in Origen, *Contra Cels.* viii. 58): "That some (higher) being or other controls things of even the most trifling nature, may be learnt from what is alleged by the Egyptians, who tell us that thirty-six (or as others affirm, a good many more) demons or divinities of the air have allotted among themselves the human body, which is supposed to be divided into a corresponding number of parts, and that each has taken one of these parts under his own peculiar charge. And they know the names of the demons in their native tongue, such as Chnumen and Chachumen and Knat and Sikat and Biu and Eru and Erebut and Ramanor and Reinanoor, or whatever else they may be called. By invoking these they cure the ailments of the different members of the body." What Celsus here alleges with respect to the Egyptians is confirmed *mutatis mutandis* by hundreds of testimonies in regard to the rest of the ancient world as well. Magic and exorcism, and that above all for curative purposes, were uncommonly popular and prevalent throughout the entire Roman Empire. Nor did the *Jewish people* form an exception. We know from the Old and New Testaments as well as from Josephus how extensively the various forms of magic prevailed also among them. In later times *Solomon* was regarded as being above all the author of this art (on the strength of 1 Kings v. 12, 13). Josephus

informs us that this monarch composed and bequeathed to posterity certain incantations by means of which demons could be restrained and so effectually expelled that they would never re-enter the man again. By way of showing the efficacy of those incantations he tells a very amusing story about a Jew of the name of Eleazar who, on one occasion and in presence of Vespasian and his sons and several Roman officers, drew out a demon through the demoniac's nose by holding a magic ring under this organ and, repeating at the same time the incantations of Solomon, forbade him ever to enter again. At length, to prove that the demon was actually expelled, he ordered this latter to overturn a vessel of water that was near at hand, which order was at once complied with (Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 2. 5). From the way in which Josephus speaks of the Solomonic incantations we feel constrained to assume that they must have been embodied in special books. Origen distinctly alleges as much. Those books survived, although only after having undergone a variety of adaptations, till far on into the Middle Ages. We still hear of one of the name of Aaron being at the court of Manuel Comnenus, and who was in possession of a βιβλον Σολομώντειον by means of which whole legions of demons could be exorcised. This literature also found its way into Christian circles. The *Decretum Gelasii* knows of a *Contradictio Salomonis*, while a Christian *Testamentum Salomonis* is still extant. And it is through popular Christian works of this sort, that the knowledge of the efficacy of Solomon's magic spells has come down to more modern times and found its way into Goethe's *Faust* (the exorcising of the poodle: "Für solche halbe Höllenbrut Ist Salomonis Schlüssel gut").

Official Judaism did not of course quite approve of those books of magic, although the Babylonian Talmud itself is full of superstition. According to a tradition, which is found both in the Mishna and in certain Byzantine writers (Suidas, Glycas), we learn that the pious king Hezekiah ordered the

suppression of Solomon's "Book of Cures," because the people trusted it so much that they neglected to pray to God.

On the subject of magic in *the ancient world generally*, an abundant store of material is to be found in Georgii's art. "Magia," in Pauly's *Real-Encyc. der class. Alterthumswissensch.* iv. 1877-1418. On the same among the *Jeux*, see the article "Zauberei," in the Bible dictionaries of Winer, Schenkel, and Riehm. On this subject in Talmudic Judaism again, see Brecher, *Das Transcendentale, Magie und magische Heilarten im Talmud*, Wien 1850. Joel, *Der Aberglaube und die Stellung des Judenthums zu demselben*, 1st part, Breslau 1881.

On Solomon, see Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 1032-1063. The *Crypta ubi Salomon daemones torquebat* were still seen at Jerusalem by the pilgrim of Bordeaux in the fourth century A.D. (Tobler, *Palaestinae descriptiones*, 1869, p. 3).

Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 2. 5: Ἐπαῶς τε συνταξάμενος αἷς περιγορεύεται τὰ νοσήματα, τρόπους ἱεροκώσεων κατέλιπεν, οἷς ἰδοῦμενα τὰ δαιμόνια ὡς μικρὴν ἱπτανίλθιν ἐκδιώκουσι κ.τ.λ. (here follows the story about Eleazar, referred to above).

Origen, *Ad. Matth.* xxvi. 63 (de la Rue, iii. 910; Lommatzsch, v. 7): Quaeret aliquis, si convenit vel daemones adjurare; et qui respicit ad multos, qui talia facere ausi sunt, dicet non sine ratione fieri hoc. Qui autem adspicit Jesum imperantem daemonibus, sed etiam potestatem dantem discipulis suis super omnia daemonia, et ut infirmitates sanarent, dicet quoniam non est secundum potestatem datam a Salvatore, adjurare daemonia; Judaicum est enim. Hoc etai aliquando a nostris tale aliquid, fiat, simile fit ei, quod a Salomone scriptis adjurationibus solent daemones adjurari. Sed ipsi, qui utuntur adjurationibus illis, aliquoties nec idoneis constitutis libris utuntur; quibusdam autem et de Hebraeo acceptis adjurant daemonia.

On the βίβλος Σολομώντιος of Aaron in the time of Manuel Comnenus, see the passage from Nicetas Choniates quoted in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 1037 sq.

Decretum Gelasii (in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 224), § 61: Scriptura quae appellatur Contradictio Salomonis, apocr. *Ibid.* § 62: Philacteria omnia quae non angelorum, ut illi confingunt, sed daemonum magis conscripta sunt nominibus apocr.

The *Christian Testamentum Salomonis* was published by Fleck, *Wissenschaftl. Reise durch Deutschland, Italien*, etc. vol. ii. 3 (1837), pp. 111-140. Also in Fürst's *Orient*, vols. v. and vii. A German translation was contributed by Bornemann (*Zeitschr. für die histor. Theol.* 1844, iii. pp. 9-56). Comp. also Bornemann, *Conjectanea in Salomonis Testamentum (Biblische Studien von Geistlichen des Königr. Sachsen*, second year 1843, pp. 45-60, for fourth year 1846, pp. 28-69). With regard to the date of its composition, comp. the passage from Leontius as given in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 1063 sq. In how strange a manner Jewish-Christian and heathen elements were all mixed up with each other may be seen for

example from two Greek manuscripts containing magical treatises which were published by Parthey (*Transactions of the Berlin Academy*, 1865).

Mishna, *Pesachim* iv. 9: "Hezekiah concealed the book of cures (ספר נפח), and the learned approved of this." Comp. the commentary of Maimonides on this in Surenhusius's *Mishna* ii. 150, where it is expressly stated that the tradition had in view Solomon's Book of Cures. Suidas (Lex. under 'Εζεκίας): Ἦν Σολομῶνι βίβλος ἰαμάτων πάθους παντός, ἐγκεικο-
λαμμένη τῇ τοῦ βασιλέως φιλίᾳ. Ταύτην ἐξεκόλαψεν Ἐζεκίας, οὐ προσίχοντος τοῦ
λαοῦ τῇ θεῇ διὰ τὸ τὰς θεραπείας τῶν παθῶν ἐνθίνει τοὺς πάσχοντας αὐτοῦ
κομίζεσθαι, περιορῶντας αἰτίαν τὸν θεόν. Glycas in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.*
i. 1042 sq.

§ 33. THE GRAECO-JEWISH LITERATURE.

Preliminary Remarks.

STILL more varied than the Palestinian-Jewish is the Graeco-Jewish literature. Scriptural and Rabbinic Judaism on the one hand, Greek philosophers, poets and historians on the other, form the factors, through whose co-operation a literature of the most motley and varied character sprang up upon the soil of the Jewish Dispersion; a literature many-sided with respect not only to its forms, but also to the standpoints taken up by its authors and the objects they pursued.

Hellenistic Judaism and its literature partake of the general intellectual and literary character of the period, viz. of that *Alexandrino-Roman epoch of Greek literature*, during which the latter left the soil of Greek nationality and became a universal literature.¹ For the nations of the Mediterranean region did not merely assimilate Greek culture, but also contributed on their part to the literary productivity of the age. In all lands authors made their appearance, whose Greek education prepared them to participate in every kind of literary effort, and whose co-operation imparted to Greek literature a cosmopolitan character; cosmopolitan in the twofold respect of origin and effect. The tide of the mental acquisitions of the East now flowed in increasingly upon Greek literature. Religion and philosophy received thence fresh impulses, poets and historians fresh material. And on the other hand the effect aimed at

¹ On its characteristics, comp. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd.-alexandr. Religionsphilosophie*, i. 1-15. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griechischen Literatur*, vol. i. (4th edit. 1876) pp. 498-577. Volkmann, art. "Alexandriener," in *Pauly's Real-Enc.* i. 1 (2nd edit.), pp. 743-753 (where other literature is also given). Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgeschichte*, vol. ii. (1876) p. 80 sq.

was also cosmopolitan, for they, who now took pen in hand, wrote not only for the little nation of the Greeks, but for the educated classes throughout the world.

In this literary productivity Hellenized Jews also took a part. And what has just been said applies to them above all others, viz. that they introduced a new element into Greek literature. The religious knowledge of Israel, which had hitherto been the possession of only a small circle, now brought its influence to bear in the department of Greek literature. The religious faith of Israel, its history and its great and sacred past, were depicted in the forms and with the means furnished by the literary culture of the Greeks, and thus made accessible to the whole world. Such Jews wrote not only for their compatriots and co-religionists, but for the purpose of making known to all mankind the illustrious history of Israel and its pre-eminent religious enlightenment.

The connection between their own national culture and that of the Greeks was of course, in the case of the Jews as well as of other Orientals, no merely external one. Judaism and Hellenism now really entered upon a process of mutual internal amalgamation.² Judaism, which in its unyielding Pharisaic phase appears so rigidly exclusive, proved itself uncommonly pliable and accommodating upon the soil of Hellenism, and allowed a far-reaching influence to the ascendant Greek spirit. The Hellenistic Jews were as unwilling as others to let themselves be deprived of that common possession of the entire educated world, the great poets, philosophers and historians of Greece. They too derived from the living spring of the Greek classics that human culture, which seemed to the ancient world the supreme good. Under its influence however Judaism imperceptibly underwent a change. It stripped itself of its particularistic character. It discovered that there were true

² On Hellenistic Judaism in general, comp. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung*, i. 15 sqq. Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, i. 99-120. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 425-579. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 303 sqq. Siegfried, *Philo*, etc. pp. 1-27. The same, "Der jüdische Hellenismus" (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875, pp. 465-489).

and Divine thoughts in the literature of the heathen world and appropriated them, it embraced all men as brethren, and desired to lead all, who were still walking in darkness, to the knowledge of the truth.

But while the Jews were thus, like other Orientals, becoming Greeks, it was at the same time seen that Judaism was something very different from the heathen religions. Its internal *power of resistance* was incomparably greater than theirs. While the other Oriental religions were merged in the general religious medley of the times, Judaism maintained itself essentially inviolate. It adhered strictly and firmly to the unity of the Godhead and the repudiation of all images in worship, and maintained the belief that God's dealings with mankind tend to a blissful end. Judaism by thus firmly adhering, in presence of the pressure exercised by Hellenism, to that which formed its essence, proved the pre-eminence of its religious strength.

The consciousness of this pre-eminence impresses its character upon the Graeco-Jewish literature. It pursues for the most part the *practical aim* of not only strengthening its co-religionists and making them acquainted with their great past, but also of convincing its non-Jewish readers of the folly of heathenism and of persuading them of the greatness of Israel's history and of the futility of all attacks upon that nation. Great part of it is therefore in the most comprehensive sense apologetic. In the predominance of the practical aim it is akin to the Palestinian. For as the latter has chiefly in view the strengthening and reviving of fidelity to the law, the Graeco-Jewish literature at least for the most part pursues the object of inspiring the non-Jewish world with respect for the people and the religion of Israel, nay if possible of bringing them to embrace the latter.

The *chief seat* of Hellenistic Judaism, and consequently of Graeco-Jewish literature, was Alexandria, the capital of the Ptolemies, which through their exertions had been raised to the first rank as a place of scholarship in the Hellenistic period.

The means of culture afforded by the age were here at disposal in a profusion not to be found elsewhere; while at the same time Jews were nowhere else found living together in so great numbers out of Palestine. Hence there was an inward necessity that Hellenic Judaism should here reach its utmost prosperity, and its literature be here chiefly cultivated. But it would be a mistake to suppose that such pursuits were cultivated *only* in Alexandria. They were indeed by no means specifically "Alexandrine," but the common possession of Hellenistic, that is extra-Palestinian Judaism in general. Nay even in Palestine they found advocates, although the Maccabean movement opposed a strong barrier to the encroachments of this tendency.³

The diversity both in literary form and theological standpoint of the works now to be discussed is chiefly dependent on their greater adherence, now to scriptural types, now to Greek models. Between the two extremes here mentioned however are found a great variety of productions, which it is difficult to subject to definite classification. The following groups may perhaps be most fitly distinguished.

I. TRANSLATIONS OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

1. *The Septuagint.*

The foundation of all Judæo-Hellenistic culture is the ancient anonymous Greek translation of the Scriptures, known by the name of the *Septuagint* (*οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα*, septuaginta interpretes), and preserved entire by the tradition of the Christian Church; Hellenistic Judaism is as inconceivable without it as the evangelical Church of Germany without Luther's translation of the Bible.⁴

³ Comp. on Hellenistic Judaism in Palestine, especially Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor* (1875), pp. 127-129.

⁴ The name "Septuagint" referred in the first place to the translation of the Pentateuch, but was afterwards transferred to the other books also.

The single name must not mislead us to the notion, that we have here to deal with a single work *not only the work of different authors, but the work also of different times* being subsequently comprised under this name. The oldest part is the translation of *the Pentateuch*, of the origin of which the so-called Epistle of Aristeas gives a detailed narrative. King Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (283–247 B.C.) was induced by his librarian Demetrius Phalereus to have the laws of the Jews also translated into Greek for his library. At his request the Jewish high priest Eleasar sent him seventy-two able men, six out of each tribe, by whose labours the whole was finished in seventy-two days (for particulars, see No. VII.). The historical nature of this account, embellished as it is by a multitude of graphic details, is now generally given up. The only question is whether the foundation of the fictitious embellishment may not perhaps be some historical tradition, the essence of which was, that the translation of the Jewish law into Greek was projected by Ptolemy Philadelphus at the instance of Demetrius Phalereus.⁵ This would in itself be very possible. For the learned and literary zeal of the Ptolemies and especially of Ptolemy Philadelphus would certainly make it conceivable, that he should wish to incorporate the law of the Jews also in his library. In favour of this view may also be cited the circumstance, that the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus, in the time of Ptolemy VI. Philometor, relates just what we have designated as the possible essence of the tradition, without betraying any acquaintance with the fictitious embellishments of the Epistle of Aristeas, which seems to show that he was following some tradition quite independent of the said Epistle.⁶ It is how-

⁵ So e.g. Wellhausen in his revision of Bleek's *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (4th ed. 1878), p. 571 sqq.

⁶ The passage from Aristobulus is given in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12, 1–2 (ed. Gaisford). Aristobulus is here speaking of the fact, that Plato was already acquainted with the Jewish legislation. To show the possibility of this he asserts, that its virtual contents had been translated into Greek before Demetrius Phalereus. Then he continues: 'Ἡ δ' ὅλη ἱερουργία

ever suspicious, that according to a very trustworthy account, Demetrius Phalereus did not live at the court of Ptolemy at all, but had already been banished by him from Alexandria immediately after the death of Ptolemy Lagos.⁷ Thus the supposed essence of the tradition also falls, and there remains merely a bare possibility that the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch owes its origin to the literary efforts of Ptolemy Philadelphus. It is also as possible, that it was called forth by the exigencies of the Jews themselves. For Jews, who had at heart the maintenance of an acquaintance with the law even among the Dispersion, observing that the knowledge of the sacred language was more and more decreasing, and that the Jews of the Dispersion were appropriating Greek as their mother tongue, might feel themselves induced to translate the law into Greek for the purpose of preserving the knowledge of it among Greek Jews also. This translation, having been in the first place undertaken as a private labour, gradually obtained official validity also. But obscure as is the origin of the translation, it may be safely admitted, on internal grounds, that its *locality was Alexandria* and its date the third century before Christ, for the Hellenist Demetrius, who wrote in the time of Ptolemy IV. (222–205), certainly made use of it (see below, No. III.).

The preceding remarks apply only to the translation of the Pentateuch, to which alone the Aristeas legend refers. But after the sacred Thorah had once been made accessible to Hellenistic Jews, the need of possessing the rest of the Scriptures in the Greek tongue was gradually experienced. Hence translations first of the *prophets* and afterwards of the *Hagiographa* followed. These too chiefly originated in Egypt.

τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως, οὗ δὲ προγόνου, προσεπικαμίνου μίζονα φιλοτιμίαν, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρίου πραγματευσαμένων τὰ περὶ τούτων.

⁷ The authority for this is Hermippus Callimachus, who lived under Ptolemy III. and IV. See the passage from Diogenes Laert. v. 78, in Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 47, and in the same work, p. 48, the discussions on the credibility of the information.

Some of the Hagiographa, such as the Book of Daniel and some of the psalms, not having been composed till the era of the Maccabees, the Greek translations of these more recent Hagiographa cannot have been made earlier than about the middle of the second century before Christ. It seems however that in fact the translations into Greek of the bulk of the Hagiographa together with the prophets were at about this time already in existence. Sirach the grandson of Jesus, who came to Egypt in the year 132, excuses the defects of his translation by the fact, that what is said in Hebrew does not retain the same meaning when translated into another language, which is, he says, the case not only in his work, but also in the Law and the Prophets and the other Scriptures (Wisdom, Prolog: οὐ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῇ εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν οὐ μόνον δὲ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ προφητεῖαι καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων οὐ μικρὰν ἔχει τὴν διαφορὰν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς λεγόμενα). Hence he evidently was already acquainted with a translation of the Prophets and the "other Scriptures." The Septuagint translation of Chronicles was certainly known to Eupolemus, who wrote about the middle of the second century before Christ (see below, paragraph 3, and Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 119); that of the Book of Job to the historian Aristeas, whose date it must be admitted is not exactly known, but who, being quoted by Alexander Polyhistor, must have lived at latest in the first half of the first century before Christ (see below, No. III., and Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 139).⁸

After what has been said no further proof of all these translations being of Jewish origin is needed. The character of the translation differs widely in the different books, being now tolerably free, now helplessly verbal, but chiefly the latter. As yet a precise investigation has been made only

⁸ Grätz insists, on utterly insufficient grounds, on transposing the translation of Job to the first century after Christ (*Monatschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums*, 1877, pp. 83-91).

of individual books. A special difficulty in such investigation lies in the fact, that it is often necessary to reconstruct the Hebrew text, which must have been in the hands of the translators. In one point however all these works are alike, viz. in the barbarous Greek produced under the influence of the Hebrew originals. *Quite a new language, swarming with such strong Hebraisms that a Greek could not understand it*, is here created. Not to mention the imitation of Hebrew constructions, many Greek words, which correspond to *one* meaning of a Hebrew word, are without further ceremony made equivalent to the *whole extent* of the meanings comprised in the Hebrew word, and thus significations are forced upon words, which they do not at all possess in Greek (e.g. the words δόξα, εἰρήνη and many others). How far colloquial intercourse with Hellenized Jews may have anticipated the labours of the translators cannot be determined. It is probable that an alternative action here took place. Much which the translators ventured upon was already found by them in colloquial language. But then the reaction upon the development of Judaic Greek exercised by a translation, which came into general use, would at the least be quite as great.

For the translations in question were not only combined into a whole, but were also *universally accepted by the Jews of the Dispersion as their text of Scripture*. The oldest Hellenists, Demetrius and Eupolemus, in their compilations of Scripture history rely solely upon the Septuagint; Philo throughout assumes it, Josephus does so for the most part. With Philo the text of the Septuagint is so far a sacred text, that he argues from its casual details, nay, not only did this translation universally penetrate into private use, but it was also used as Holy Scripture in the synagogue service (see vol. ii. Div. ii. p. 285). It was then transferred from the hands of the Jews to the Christian Church and regarded by it as the authentic text of Scripture. But the very circumstance of the Christian Church taking possession of this translation and deriving thence its polemical weapons in its conflict with the Jews,

gradually co-operated in bringing the Septuagint into discredit with them and in giving rise to new Jewish translations, especially that of Aquila, which in the time of Origen stood in higher respect with the Jews than did the Septuagint.

The text of the Septuagint has come down to us solely by the tradition of the Christian Church. In its history the learned labours of Origen, which finally—and not without his own fault—led to a base corruption of the text, are epoch-making. Origen, on account of the uncertainty of the Septuagint text, and its great deviations from the Hebrew, prepared a large edition of the Bible, in which were written, in six adjacent columns: (1) The Hebrew text in Hebrew characters; (2) the Hebrew text in Greek characters; (3) the translation of Aquila; (4) that of Symmachus; (5) the Septuagint; (6) the translation of Theodotion, and indeed in this order (see Hieronymus, *Comment. in Tit.* iii. 9 [Opp. ed. Vallarsi, vii. 1. 734]; Epiphan. *de mensuris et ponderibus*, § 19, and the other evidences in Field, *Origenis hexaplorum quae supersunt prolegom.* p. 50). This was to lay a sure foundation for learned Scripture exegesis, and especially for learned controversy against the Jews, who often reproached Christians with their ignorance of the genuine text of Scripture (see on the motive and object of his undertaking, Origen, *Comment. in Matth.* vol. xv. c. xiv.; *epist. ad African.* § 5). The work, affording a sixfold Scripture text, was called *the Hexapla*. Origen also prepared another edition without the two Hebrew columns, which was called *the Tetrapla* (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 16). On the other hand it was also called *Octapla*, because in certain books of the Old Testament two anonymous Greek translations were added to the above-named six texts (Epiphan. *de mensuris et ponderibus*, § 19; Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 16. Comp. on the whole work the Prolegomena in Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 2 vols. Oxonii 1875, and the Introductions to the Old Test. of e.g. De Wette-Schrader, § 56; Bleek-Wellhausen, § 282). The fatal circumstance was, that Origen was not content with placing the text of the Septuagint in juxtaposition with the others, but, to facilitate its use, *noted in the Septuagint text itself the deviations from the Hebrew* by (a) furnishing such words, sentences, or paragraphs as were missing in the Hebrew with an obelus (the sign of erasure), and (b) *by interpolating, with the addition of an asterisk, from other translations, and mostly from Theodotion, those found in the Hebrew and missing in the Septuagint* (see his own remarks in his *Comment. in Matth.* vol. xv. c. xiv. [Lommatzsch, iii. 357]: καὶ τὰ αὐτὴν ὠβελίσσαμεν ἐν τῷ ἱβραϊκῷ μὴ κείμενα, οὐ τοιμήσαντες αὐτὰ

πάντη περιελθὲν τινὰ δὲ μετ' ἀστερίσκων προσθήκαμεν. Hieronymus, *Praef. in vers. Paralipom.* [ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1407 sq.]: sed, quod majoris, audaciae est, in editione Septuaginta Theodotionis editionem miscuit, asteriscis designans quae minus ante fuerant, et virgulis, quae ex superfluo videbantur apposita). He often proceeded also in a similar manner with inaccurate translations of the LXX. "by adding with an asterisk, behind the obelized reading of the LXX., the parallel passages corresponding with the Hebrew from another version" (Bleek-Wellhausen, p. 586). This text then, especially copied from the Hexapla, and often showing very careless dealing with the critical marks, being disseminated since Eusebius (see Field, *Prolcg.* p. 99), a mass of such "hexaplarian" readings was introduced into the traditional text of the Septuagint; the common text (κοινή ἔκδοσις) being corrected by this hexaplarian one. The exclusion of hexaplarian additions is therefore the chief task of Septuagint criticism; and this is still approximately attainable for most of the books of the Old Testament, the critical notes of Origen being still extant, partly in certain Greek manuscripts, partly in the Syriac translation of the hexaplarian Septuagint text (see Bleek-Wellhausen, *Eintl. in das A. T.* pp. 593, 588 sqq.). The inserted matter has been very completely collected in Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt, sive veterum interpretum Graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*, 2 vols. Oxonii 1875. By the separation however from the hexaplarian text of the Septuagint of the passages marked with an asterisk, the original text is by no means obtained. The MSS. already varied very much in the time of Origen (see *Comment. in Matth.* vol. xv. c. xiv., ed. Lommatzsch, iii. 357). Origen first compiled from them a text for himself, and then quietly altered, according to the Hebrew, many particulars in it, which could not be made known by obelus or asterisk (Field, p. 60 sqq.). Hence such a proceeding will only obtain the *Recension of Origen*.

Others besides Origen have occupied themselves with learned labours upon the text of the Septuagint. We know especially of two other recensions, those of Hesychius and Lucianus; the former of these was disseminated in Egypt, the latter from Antioch to Constantinople (Hieronimus, *praef. in vers. Paralipom.*, ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1405 sq.: Alexandria et Egypta in Septuaginta suis Hesychium laudat auctorem. Constantinopolis usque Antiochiam Luciani Martyris exemplaria probat. Mediae inter has provinciae Palestinos codices legunt, quos ab Origine elaboratos Eusebius et Pamphilus vulgaverunt; totusque orbis hac inter se trifaria varietate compugnat). Hesychius is perhaps identical with the Egyptian bishop of this name, who

suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Maximinus, 312 (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* viii. 13. 7). No particulars are known concerning the nature of his recension. Lucianus was the noted presbyter of Antioch, who also suffered martyrdom in the persecution of Maximinus, 312 (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* viii. 13. 2, ix. 6. 3). His recension was an emendation of the Septuagint according to the Hebrew with the help of other Greek translations (Suidas, *Lex. s.v.*: Λουκιανὸς ὁ μάρτυς αὐτὸς ἀπάσας [scil. τὰς ἱερὰς βιβλούς] ἀναλαβὼν ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊδοῦ αὐτὰς ἰσπανιώσατο γλώττης, ἣν καὶ αὐτὴν ἠκριβωκώς ἐ; τὰ μάλισσα ἦν). Comp. Field, *Proleg.* cap. ix. Harnack in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. viii. 767 sqq. on "Hesychius and Lucianus." Also the Introductions to the Old Testament, e.g. De Wette-Schrader, § 57; Bleek-Wellhausen, § 283. According to the recent investigations of Field and Lagarde (see *Theol. Litztg.* 1876, p. 605), the recension of Lucianus is still preserved in several MSS. Lagarde has edited the text according to these (one volume has as yet appeared, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti canonicorum pars 1 graece edita*, Götting. 1883).

The labours however of Hesychius and Lucianus have but contributed to further confusion in the text of the Septuagint. For the text of the *καινή* is now not only mixed up with the Hexapla text, but also with those of Hesychius and Lucianus, and the former having been, even in the text of Origen, very uncertain, there is no longer any prospect of a certain recovery of the *original* text of the Septuagint. It is true that being still acquainted with the chief recensions, we are in a position safely to pronounce judgment as to which of the MSS. is comparatively freest from the peculiarities of these recensions, and therefore represents with the greatest comparative purity the original text. The *old Latin texts* also furnish important assistance.

Among those Greek *manuscripts*, which contain the whole Old Testament or at least a great part of it, the *Vaticanus* (1209) is acknowledged to hold the first rank with respect to the purity of the text. Its text has been ostensibly published by Mai (*Vetus et Novum Testamentum ex antiquissimo codice Vaticano*, 5 vols. Rome 1857). His edition is however very untrustworthy. More accurate is the new Roman *édition de luxe* in facsimile type (*Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecus codex Vaticanus*, edd. Vercellone and Cozza, 6 vols. Rom 1868–1881, price of each vol. £6; comp. also *Theol. Litztg.* 1882, p. 121). Next to the *Vaticanus* must be mentioned the *Sinaiticus*, discovered by Tischendorf in the year 1859, of which about half of the Old Testament has been preserved. *Édition de luxe*, *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus*, ed. Tischendorf, 4 vols. Petersburg 1862. Tischendorf had previously discovered a smaller portion of this manuscript, and published it under the title of *Frederico-Augustanus* (*Codex Frederico-Augustanus*, ed. Tischen-

dorf, Lips. 1846).—The Alexandrinus, which is already much infected by hexaplarian readings, ranks third among these great Bible manuscripts. It forms the foundation of Grabe's edition of the Septuagint. The *Vetus Testamentum Graecum e Codice MS. Alexandrino, cura Henrici Herveii Baber*, 3 vols. London 1812–1826, gives the text of the MS. itself. Recently an edition has been prepared in photo-lithographic facsimile, of which the portion comprising the New Testament has been first issued (*Facsimile of the Codex Alexandrinus, New Testament and Clementine Epistles, published by order of the Trustees*, London 1879; comp. *Theol. Litztg.* 1880, p. 230).—The Old Testament appeared in 3 vols. 1881 sqq. Comp. also on the manuscripts the Prolegomena of the editions, especially Holmes - Parsons and Tischendorf. The publications of Tischendorf (*Monumenta sacra inedita*) and Ceriani (*Monumenta sacra et profana*) contain much material.

Bibliographical information concerning the numerous editions of the Septuagint will be found in Le Long, *Bibliotheca sacra*, ed. Masch. vol. ii. 2, 1781, pp. 262–304. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca graeca*, ed. Harles, iii. 673 sqq. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese*, vol. ii. 1798, pp. 279–322. Winer, *Handbuch der Theol. Literatur*, i. 47 sq. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, 1841, pp. 242–252. Tischendorf, Prolegomena to his edition. De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung in das A. T.* § 58. All the editions fall back upon the following four chief editions: (1) The Complutensian Polyglot, 6 vols. in *Complutensi universitate*, 1514–1517. (2) The Aldina, *Sacrae Scripturae Veteris Novaeque omnia*, Venice 1518. (3) The Roman or Sixtine edition, *Vetus Testamentum juxta Septuaginta ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. editum*, Rome 1587. The text of this edition is relatively the best among the printed texts, conforming as it does frequently, though by no means entirely, to the Vaticanus, 1209. Since the majority of the more recent editions reproduce this Sixtine text, the printed common text is a relatively good one. (4) Grabe's edition, *Septuaginta Interpretum*, vols. i.–iv. ed. Grabe, Oxonii 1707–1720. It chiefly follows the Codex Alexandrinus. Of recent editions the most important is *Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, edd. Holmes and Parsons, 5 vols. Oxonii 1798–1827. The text is reproduced from the Sixtine edition, but accompanied by an unusually copious collection of manuscript various readings. Though what is offered is not quite trustworthy, and rather confuses than instructs by its copiousness, still this edition has the merit of having for the first time brought forward the material furnished by the MSS. in general (comp. Bleek and Wellhausen, *Einl. in das A. T.* p. 592 sq.). The manual edition of Tischendorf, *Vetus Testamentum Graece juxta LXX. interpretes*, 2 vols. Lips. 1850,

2nd ed. 1880, also gives the Sixtine text with only unimportant corrections. Nestle has added to the sixth edition a collation of the Vaticanus and Sinaiticus, as well as of the Alexandrinus already collated by Tischendorf (*Veteris Testamenti Graeci codices Vaticanus et Sinaiticus cum textu recepto collati ab E. Nestle*, Lips. 1880).

The literature on the Septuagint is almost unbounded (comp. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* iii. 658 sqq. Rosenmüller, *Handb. für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese*, ii. 395 sqq. De Wette-Schrader, *Einl. in das A. T.* § 51 sqq. Fritzsche in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2 vols. i. 280 sqq.). The chief work of earlier date is: Hody, *De biblicorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina vulgata*, Oxon. 1705. Of recent times may be mentioned: (1) On single books, Thiersch, *De Pentateuchi versione Alexandrina*, Erlang. 1841. Hollenberg, *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Uebersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischer Werth*, Moers 1876 (Gymnasial-progr.). Wichelhaus, *De Jeremiae versione Alexandrina*, Halis 1847. Vollers, *Das Dodekapropheten der Alexandriner*, 1st half, Berlin 1880. The same in Stade's *Zeitschr. für die alttestamentl. Wissensch.* vol. iii. 1883, pp. 219-272, vol. iv. 1884, pp. 1-20. Lagarde, *Anmerkungen zur griechischen Uebersetzung der Proverben*, Leipzig 1863. Bickell, *De indole ac ratione versionis Alex. in interpretando libro Jobi*, Marb. 1863. (2) On the whole: Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, Leipzig 1841. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 465 sqq., 534-556. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 322 sqq. Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 8-18. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religions-Philosophie*, ii. 1-72. Fritzsche, art. "Alexandrinische Uebersetzung des A. T.," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 280-290. The Introductions to the Old Testament of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hävernick, Keil and others, especially De Wette, *Lehrbuch der hist.-krit. Einl. in die kanon und apokr. Bücher des A. T.* viii., edited by Schrader (1869), § 51-53. Bleek, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4th ed., superintended by Wellhausen (1878), pp. 571-598. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 436-439.

2. Aquila and Theodotion.

The Septuagint translation was indisputably regarded as the sacred text of the Scriptures by Hellenistic Jews down to the beginning of the second century after Christ. The period of its ascendancy is at the same time that of the prime of Hellenistic Judaism. Subsequently to the second century the

latter entered upon a slow but continuous course of retrogression, which—to leave out of consideration the limits prescribed to the encroachments of Judaism by political legislation—was mainly brought about by the co-operation of two factors, viz. the increased power of Rabbinic Judaism and the victorious advance of Christianity. A significant symptom in this movement was *the new Greek translations of the Bible, the object of which was to place in the hand of Greek-speaking Jews a text in conformity with the authorized Hebrew one*. It is true, that on the one hand the undertaking of such translations was a proof of the still existing strength and importance of Hellenistic Judaism. On the other hand however they show, that Hebrew authority had now attained acceptance and acknowledgment in a far stricter sense than formerly in the region of Hellenistic Judaism. The Jews of the Dispersion were renouncing their own culture and placing themselves under the guardianship of the Rabbins. These translations are at the same time a monument in the history of the struggle between Judaism and Christianity. They were to place in the hands of the Jews a polemical weapon in their contest with Christian theologians, who were making the most of the very uncertain Septuagint text in their own cause (comp. especially Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 68, *s. fin.*, 71 and elsewhere).

Of the three Greek translations of the Bible, which Origen placed in his Hexapla of the Septuagint (Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, see above, p. 164) only Aquila and Theodotion will here engage our notice; for Symmachus was, according to Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 17, an Ebionite and therefore a Christian. Of Theodotion too it is not certain whether he was a Jew. Aquila on the contrary is unanimously designated as such, and indeed as a proselyte.

According to Irenaeus, who is the first to mention Aquila, he was a Jewish proselyte of Pontus. The statement with respect to his native land is, by reason of its striking parallel with Acts xviii. 2, somewhat suspicious, though Epiphanius more precisely names Sinope in Pontus as his home. On the

other hand it seems certain—notwithstanding his thorough knowledge of Hebrew—that Aquila was a proselyte. For he is designated as such (עֲקִילָס הַיְּוָנִי) not only by all the Fathers, but also in the Jerusalem Talmud and in Rabbinic literature in general. Of the fables related of him by Epiphanius—that he was a relation (πενθερίδης) of the Emperor Hadrian, that he at first turned Christian, then was excluded from the Christian Church on account of his inclination to astrology and became a Jew—thus much is credible, that he lived in the time of Hadrian. Rabbinical tradition also places him in the time of R. Elieser, R. Joshua and R. Akiba, and thus in the first decades of the second century after Christ. The aim of his translation was to imitate the Hebrew text as exactly as possible, so that he not only ventured upon the bold formation of a multitude of new words, for the purpose of obtaining Greek terms, which should exactly correspond with Hebrew ones, but he slavishly rendered Hebrew particles by Greek particles, even when their meaning did not allow it (for proof of this see Field and others). A noted example ridiculed by Jerome is, that in the very first sentence of Genesis he rendered the sign of the accusative הָאֵל by σύν (σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τῇ γῇ). This attention to the most trifling detail may perhaps be referred to the influence of Akiba, whose pupil Aquila is said to have been. Jerome often mentions a *prima* and *secunda editio* of Aquila. And the numerous passages in which two different translations are referred to Aquila (collected in Field), confirm the existence of two different editions of the work. On account of its close accordance with the Hebrew text the work was at its first appearance favoured by R. Elieser and R. Joshua the eminent Rabbinical authorities, and was, as testified by Origen and also indirectly confirmed by Justinian's 146th *Novella*, soon much preferred to the LXX. by Hellenistic Jews. About a dozen passages are quoted from it in Rabbinic literature. The work as a whole perished with Rabbinic Judaism. For what remains of it we are indebted to its admission into Origen's Hexapla.

Numerous notices of Aquila's translation are preserved from the latter work, some by quotations in Eusebius, Jerome and other Fathers, who still made use of the original Hexapla in the library of Pamphilus at Caesarea (Hieron. *comment. in Tit.* iii. 9, ed. Vallarsi, vii. 1. 734), some in marginal notes in the MSS. of the Hexaplarian Septuagint text.

Irenaeus, iii. 21. 1 (in Greek in Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 8. 10): ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἔνιοι φασὶ τῶν νῦν τοιμῶντων μεθερμηνεύειν τὴν γραφὴν "ἰδοὺ ἡ μεᾶνις ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τρέχεται υἱόν," ὡς Θεοδοσίῳν ἡρμηνεύσεν ὁ Ἐφρέσιος καὶ Ἀκύλας ὁ Ποντικὸς, ἀμφοτέρω Ἰουδαῖοι προσήλυτοι. Eusebius, *Demonstr. evang.* vii. 1. 32, ed. Gaisford (p. 316, ed. Paris): προσήλυτος δὲ ὁ Ἀκύλας ἦν, οὗ φύσει Ἰουδαῖος. Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, § 14, 15.

Hieronymus, *Epist.* 57 *ad Pammachium*, c. 11 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, i. 316): Aquila autem proselytus et contentiosus interpres, qui non solum verba sed etymologias quoque verborum transferre conatus est, jure projicitur a nobis. Quis enim pro frumento et vino et oleo possit vel legere vel intelligere χεῦμα, βωωρισμόν, σιλπανότητα, quod nos possumus dicere fusionem pomationem et splendentiam. Aut quia Hebraei non solum habent ἄρθρα sed et πύματα, ille κακοζήλως et syllabas interpretatur et literas dicitque σὺν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ σὺν τῇ γῇ, quod Graeca et Latina lingua omnino non recipit. Jerome generally gives a very favourable opinion of the accuracy and trustworthiness of Aquila. See *Epist.* 32 *ad Marcellam* (Vallarsi, i. 152), *Comm. in Jesaj.* xlix. 5, 6 (Vallarsi, iv. 564), *Comm. in Hoseam* ii. 16, 17 (Vallarsi, vi. 656). See the passages of Jerome in which he mentions the *prima* and *secunda editio* of Aquila, in Field, *Origenis Hexaplae quae supersunt, proleg.* p. xxv. sq.

Talmud jer. *Megilla* i. 11, fol. 71^o: הירגם עקלים הנר לפני ר' אלעזר הלני ר' יהושע וקילס אותו ואמרו לו פסיפת מבני אדם, "Aquila the proselyte translated the Torah in the time of R. Elieser and R. Joshua; and they praised him and said to him, 'Thou art the fairest among the children of men'" (Ps. xlv. 3, with an allusion to the translation of the Torah into the Japhetic). Jer. *Kiddushin* i. 1, fol. 59^a: הירגם עקלים הנר לפני ר' עקיבא, "Aquila the proselyte translated in the time of Akiba," etc. Hieronymus, *Comment. in Jes.* viii. 11 sq. (Vallarsi, iv. 122 sq.): Akibas quem magistrum Aquilae proselyti autumant. (Comp. vol. i. Div. ii. p. 376.) A collection of Rabbinical passages, in which the translation of Aquila is quoted, is already given by Asariah de Rossi, *Meor Enajim*, c. 45; comp. also Wolf, *Biblioth. Hebraea*, i. 958-960, iii. 890-894; Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 82 sq.; and most exhaust-

ively by Anger, *De Akila*, pp. 12–25. The name of Aquila is in Rabbinical literature often distorted into *Ὀνκῆλος* (Onkelos); so also *e.g.* in all the passages of the Tosefta, see Zuckermannel's edition, Index, *s.v.* *Ὀνκῆλος*.

Origenes, *epist. ad African.* c. 2: 'Ακύλας . . . φιλοτιμότερον πεπιστευμένος παρὰ Ἰουδαίους ἡρμηνευκέναι τὴν γραφὴν ᾧ μάλιστα εἰώθασιν οἱ ἀγιοῦντες τὴν Ἑβραίων διάλεκτον χρῆσθαι, ὡς πάντων μᾶλλον ἐπιτετιυγμένῳ. It is mentioned in Justinian's *Novella* 146, that it was disputed among the Jews themselves, whether the Scriptures were to be read in Hebrew or Greek in the synagogue service. Justinian directs that the latter shall not be hindered, and, as a Christian emperor, recommends in the first place the use of the Septuagint, but permits also the use of Aquila's translation (which was thus manifestly preferred by the Jews).

The fragments are very completely collected in Field, *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt*, 2 vols. Oxonii 1875. The chief work formerly was Montfaucon, *Hexaplorum Origenis quae supersunt*, 2 vols. Paris 1713. Freudenthal regards the Septuagint translation of Ecclesiastes as the work of Aquila, see *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 65, note.

The Literature: Hody, *De bibliorum textibus* (1705), pp. 573–578. Montfaucon, *Hexapl. Orig., praelim.* pp. 46–51. Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, iii. 690–692. Anger, *De Onkelo, Chaldaico quem ferunt Pentateuchi paraphraste et quid ei rationis intercedat cum Akila, Graeco Veteris Testamenti interprete*, Part I.: *De Akila*, Lips. 1845. Field, *Proleg.* pp. xvi.–xxvii. Arnold, art. "Bibelübersetzungen," in *Herzog's Real-Enc.* 1st ed. ii. 187 sq. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vii. 386–390. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 62–64. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 2nd ed. p. 437 sqq. Lagarde, *Clementina* (1865), p. 12 sqq. Joel, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte* (1880), p. 43 sqq. *Die Einleitungen in's Alte Testament von Eichhorn* (4th ed.), i. 521–531; Bertholdt, ii. 534–537; Herbst, i. 155–157; Keil (3rd ed.), p. 557 sq.; De Wette-Schrader, § 55; Bleek-Wellhausen, § 281.

It might appear questionable whether Theodotion, who as well as Symmachus is as a rule called an Ebionite by Jerome, should be named here at all. But Jerome elsewhere calls him a Jew, and in a passage, in which he expresses himself most precisely, states the former as only the opinion of some. The other opinion, viz. that Theodotion was a Jew, and indeed a Jewish proselyte, is evidenced by Irenaeus and also by Epiphanius, whose fictions (that Theodotion was at first a

Marcionite and then went over to Judaism) are not deserving of credit. According to Irenaeus, Theodotion was a native of Ephesus. Epiphanius makes him a Marcionite and a native of Pontus. With regard to his date Epiphanius, who places him under Commodus (A.D. 180–192), is generally credited. But the statements of Epiphanius are here untrustworthy. Nor must the circumstance, that Origen places Theodotion in the last place in his Hexapla, mislead us to the notion of his being the most recent of these translators of Scripture.* He is at all events a predecessor of Irenaeus and very probably not more recent than Aquila, for *the use of his translation in the Shepherd of Hermas* has lately been raised to almost a certainty. The work of Theodotion pursues in general the same object as that of Aquila, viz. that of furnishing a translation, which should render the Hebrew text more accurately than is done by the LXX. Theodotion however bases his work upon the LXX., correcting the latter according to the Hebrew, so that it can only be called a thorough revision of this translation with which it is however in very close accordance. One peculiarity of his work is, that he transcribes Hebrew words into Greek without translating them even more frequently than Aquila and Symmachus (Field gives a list of all the known cases, *Proleg.* p. 40 sq.). We have no evidence of the use of this translation among the Jews. *His translation of Daniel*, having been received by the Christian Church and having therefore supplanted the original Septuagint translation of Daniel in the Septuagint manuscripts, *has come down to us complete* (the latter is preserved in only *one MS.*, a *codex Chisianus*).¹⁰ For the rest numerous fragments of Theodotion have been preserved in the same manner as those of Aquila.

* The order in the Hexapla is arranged simply from the view-point of matter. Origen gives first the Hebrew text, then Aquila and Symmachus as most closely conforming to the Hebrew text, then the LXX. and after this Theodotion, because his work was properly but a revision of the LXX.

¹⁰ In Theodotion's version of Daniel, *the apocryphal additions are also retained*. From this Jerome translated them (see *Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1376. 1399).

Hieronymus, *De viris illustr.* c. liv. (Vallarsi, ii. 893): Aquilae scilicet Pontici proselyti et Theodotionis Hebionaei et Symmachi ejusdem dogmatis. Idem, *Comment. in Habak.* iii. 11–13 (Vallarsi, vi. 656): Theodotio autem vere quasi pauper et Ebionita sed et Symmachus ejusdem dogmatis pauperem sensum secuti Judaice transtulerunt. . . . Isti *Semichristiani* Judaice transtulerunt, et Judaeus Aquila interpretatus est ut Christianus. Idem, *praef. in vers. Iob* (Vallarsi, ix. 1100): Judaeus Aquila, Symmachus et Theodotio *judaizantes haeretici*. Elsewhere however Jerome calls Theodotion simply a Jew, see *Epist.* 112 *ad Augustin.* c. 19 (Vallarsi, i. 752): *hominis Judaci atque blasphemii*. Jerome expresses himself most precisely in the *praef. comment. in Daniel* (Vallarsi, v. 619 sq.): Illud quoque lectorem admoneo, Daniele non juxta LXX. interpretes sed juxta Theodotionem ecclesias legere, qui utique post adventum Christi *incredulus fuit, licet eum quidam dicant Ebionitam*, qui altero genere Judaeus est.

Irenaeus, iii. 21. 1 (= Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8. 10); see the passage above, p. 171. Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, § 17, 18.

As for the chronology, the circumstance which is chiefly decisive is, that Theodotion was certainly the predecessor of Irenaeus. For the latter not only expressly mentions him, but also makes use of his translation of Daniel (see Zahn, art. "Irenaeus," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. vii. 131). The relation of Justin Martyr to Theodotion is doubtful. The text of the long portion, which he quotes from Daniel, *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. xxxi., agrees indeed in many minutiae with Theodotion in opposition to the Septuagint of the *cod. Chisianus*, and yet the use of the former cannot be inferred, because the agreement with the latter preponderates. See Credner, *Beitrag zur Einl. in die biblischen Schriften*, vol. ii. (1838) pp. 253–274. In the Shepherd of Hermas, *Vis.* iv. 2. 4, however use is freely made of Daniel vi. 23, and that in a form which strikingly agrees with Theodotion in opposition to the LXX. (see Hort in John Hopkins' *University Circular*, December 1884, and Harnack, *Theol. Litztg.* 1885, p. 146). Hence it can scarcely be doubted that he preceded Hermas. *But perhaps he was also a predecessor of Aquila*, for after the acceptance of Aquila's translation by the Hellenistic Jews, forming as it does the first halting-place on the way to the formation of a Greek translation of the Bible in strict conformity with the Hebrew, his would have been tolerably superfluous. This assumption will also explain his disappearance from Jewish tradition. It is also worthy of remark, that Irenaeus names him before Aquila. Finally, it may also be mentioned, that in the *Revelation of St. John* sentences and expressions from Daniel are used in a form

which accords more with Theodotion than the Septuagint (ix. 20, x. 5, xiii. 7, xx. 4. Comp. Salmon, *Introduction to the Study of the Books of the Old Testament*, 1885, pp. 654-668; and in accordance with it Harnack, *Theol. Litzg.* 1885, p. 267). It must however be confessed, that the accordances are not of a kind to allow us to infer with certainty an acquaintance with Theodotion's work on the part of the writer of the Apocalypse.

On the relation of Theodotion to the Septuagint, Jerome says in his *Comment. in Ecclesiastes*, ii. (Vallarsi, iii. 396): Septuaginta vero et Theodotio sicut in pluribus locis ita et in hoc quoque concordant (*i.e.* in opposition to Aquila and Symmachus).

The acceptance of Theodotion's version of Daniel by the Christian Church in place of the Septuagint is repeatedly testified by Jerome, see *Contra Rufin.* ii. 33 (Vallarsi, ii. 527); *præf. comment. in Daniel* (Vallarsi, v. 619 sq.); *præf. in version. Daniel* (Vallarsi, ix. 1361 sq.).

The Literature: Hody, *De biblicorum textibus* (1705), pp. 579-585. Montfaucon, *Hexapl. Orig. prælim.* pp. 56, 57. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca graec.*, ed. Harles, iii. 692-695. Field, *Orig. Hexapl. proleg.* pp. xxxviii.-xlii. Arnold, art. "Bibelübersetzungen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. ii. 188. Fürst in the *Literaturbl. des Orients*, 1848, p. 793. Credner, as above. Zahn, as above. *Supernatural Religion* (complete edition, 1879), ii. 210 sq. The Introductions to the Old Testament of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Herbst, Keil, De Wette-Schrader, Bleek-Wellhausen and others. The older literature in Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 420-422.

II. REVISION AND COMPLETION OF SCRIPTURE LITERATURE.

The work of Aquila and its favourable reception on the part of the Hellenistic Jews prove, that from about the second century after Christ, Hellenistic Judaism also kept strictly to the text and canon of the Palestinians. This is confirmed by the expressions of Origen in his Epistle to Julius Africanus. He here speaks of such component parts of the canon as are missing in the Hebrew, especially of the additions to Daniel and Esther, and the Books of Tobit and Judith, as if they had never belonged to the Jewish canon. He regards them as the exclusive possession of Christians and

says plainly that they are rejected by the Jews, without making any distinction between Greek and Hebrew Jews (*Epist. ad African.* c. 2, 3, and 13). Hence the canon of the Palestinians was at that time absolutely valid among the Jews of the Dispersion also. This was not the case in earlier times. The Jews of the Dispersion indeed always possessed on the whole the same Scriptures as those of Palestine. But *in Palestine the canon attained a settled form about the second century before Christ.* Later works, even when they appeared under the name of sacred authorities and found approbation, were no longer incorporated therein. *Among the Hellenistic Jews, on the contrary, the boundaries still fluctuated for some centuries.* A whole multitude of works, originating in the last two centuries before or even in the first after Christ, were united by them to the collection of the Holy Scriptures, and among them some also which, being originally written in Hebrew and originating in Palestine, did not become the property of Hellenistic Judaism till they had been translated into Greek. We have certainly no direct evidence of this fact. But the fact that the Christian canon of the Old Testament was from the beginning of wider and more vacillating extent than the Hebrew, can only be explained by the circumstance, that the Christian Church received the canon in just this form from the hands of Hellenistic Judaism. Hence the latter, at the time of the founding of the Christian Church, had in its collection of Holy Scriptures those books, which are in the Protestant Church designated, according to the precedent of Jerome, as "apocryphal," because they are absent from the Hebrew canon. One thing however must not be forgotten, that on the whole no settled boundary existed.

It is in accordance with this long maintained freedom in dealing with the canon, that the *Hellenistic Jews allowed themselves a liberty of procedure with single works longer than the Palestinians did.* In the same manner as Palestinian Judaism had *formerly* acted with respect to its literature, did Hellenistic Judaism during our period also, freely handle and

enrich by additions works already canonical in Palestine. This treatment had as a rule the same motives and objects as the legendary embellishment of more ancient sacred history. The only difference was, that in the case of books already canonical, the legend was placed beside the Scripture text, while in that of books not as yet received into the canon, it was interpolated in the text itself.

The majority of those books which, though admitted by the Hellenistic Jews into the collection of the Holy Scriptures, originally made no claim to be esteemed as such, has therefore been treated of by us elsewhere. We here group together only (1) the revisions and completions of such books as had in their more ancient forms become canonical in Palestine (Ezra, Esther, Daniel, the Prayer of Manasseh [an addition to 2 Chron. xxxiii.]), and (2) certain books, which from the first aspired to be regarded as Scripture, and which entered as such into the Hellenistic collection of the Scriptures (Baruch, the Epistle of Jeremiah).

1. *The Greek Ezra.*

Besides the Greek translation of the Hebrew canonical Book of Ezra, there is also a free Greek revision, differing from the canonical Ezra partly by transpositions, partly by interpolations. The exact relation between the two will appear from the following survey of the composition of the Greek Ezra :—

Chap. i. = 2 Chron. xxxv.—xxxvi. : Restoration of the temple worship under Josiah (639–609), and history of the successors of Josiah down to the destruction of the temple (588).

Chap. ii. 1–14 = Ezra i. : Cyrus in the first year of his reign (537) permits the return of the exiles and delivers up the sacred vessels.

- Chap. ii. 15-25 = Ezra iv. 7-24: In consequence of a complaint against the Jews, Artaxerxes forbids (465-425) the continuance of the rebuilding of (the temple and) the walls of Jerusalem.
- Chap. iii.-v. 6: independent: Zerubbabel obtains the favour of Darius (521-485) and receives from him permission for the return of the exiles.
- Chap. v. 7-70 = Ezra ii. 1-iv. 5: A list of those who returned with Zerubbabel, the operations of Zerubbabel and the interruption of the building of the temple in the time of Cyrus (536-529) till the second year of Darius (520).
- Chap. vi.-vii. = Ezra v.-vi.: Resumption and completion of the rebuilding of the temple in the sixth year of Darius (516).
- Chap. viii. - ix. 36 = Ezra vii. - x.: Return of Ezra with a train of exiles in the seventh year of Artaxerxes (458); commencement of Ezra's operations.
- Chap. ix. 37-55 = Neh. vii. 73-viii. 13: Public reading of the law by Ezra

According to this survey the reviser of the canonical Ezra took in hand the following changes: 1. The portion chap. iv. 7-24 of the canonical Ezra is removed to an earlier place. 2. The portion chaps. iii.-v. 6 of the Greek Ezra is interpolated from an unknown source. 3. The book opens with 2 Chron. xxxv.-xxxvi. 4. Neh. vii. 73-viii. 13 is added at the close. By the two first-named operations the confusion partly begotten by the canonical Ezra is considerably increased. For in this latter the portion chap. iv. 6-23 stands out of place. It belongs to a much later period, and treats not of the interruption of the rebuilding of the temple, but of an interruption in the building of the walls. The editor of the Greek Ezra has indeed rescued this passage from the connection in which it is incorrectly placed, but

only to transpose it to a position if possible still more erroneous, taking at the same time the liberty of adding to it by way of completion the interruption of the building of the temple. Not however contented with this, he has also interpolated the paragraph chaps. iii.-v. 6, which transposes us to the times of Darius, while subsequently (v. 7-70) the times of Cyrus are again spoken of. Thus then the history goes directly backwards; first we have (ii. 15-25) Artaxerxes, then (iii.-v. 6) Darius, and lastly (v. 7-70) Cyrus. And in the last-named portion we are told in the most unembarrassed manner that Zerubbabel returned with the exiles in the time of Cyrus (comp. v. 8, 67-70), while previously it was expressly stated that Zerubbabel received permission for their return from the special favour of Darius. With respect to the documents which were in the hands of our compiler only two things remain to be noticed: 1. That he did not translate the canonical Ezra from the Hebrew (so Fritzsche and most others), but compiled from the Septuagint (so rightly Keil, *Eint.* 3rd ed. p. 704 sq.). 2. That he certainly discovered beforehand the portion chaps. iii.-v. 6, since it stands in direct opposition to the rest of the narrative. It seems to be a Greek original and not a translation from the Hebrew. The *object* of the whole compilation has been on the whole correctly expressed by Bertholdt (*Eint.* iii. 1011): "He intended to compile from older works a history of the temple from the last epoch of the legal worship to its rebuilding and the restoration of the prescribed ritual therein." Evidently however he meant to give also still more concerning Nehemiah, for the abrupt conclusion could not possibly have been intentional. With respect to the date of the book, all that can be said is, that it was already used by Josephus (*Antt.* xi. 1-5).

Josephus in his account of the restoration of the theocracy (*Antt.* xi. 1-5) entirely conforms to the course of this Greek Ezra. For he brings what is contained in chaps. ii. 15-25 and iii.-v. 6 of this book into the same position and the same order,

i.e. interpolates it between the first and second chapters of the canonical Ezra (*Antt.* xi. 2-3). In so doing however he does not proceed without historical criticism, for he simply changes Artaxerxes, who in the Greek Ezra is inserted in a quite impossible place, into Cambyses, so as to restore the correct order: Cyrus, Cambyses, Darius. He removes the further historical stumbling-block of the Greek Ezra, of Cyrus re-appearing after Darius, by doing away with Cyrus in this place and making the return of the exiles first take place under Darius. This indeed restores the correct order of the Persian kings, but a narrative is thus concocted, which differs still more widely from actual history than that of the Greek Ezra itself.

Apparently this book was generally and from the first used in the Christian Church also. Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 124: 'Ενταῦθα Ζοροβάβελ σοφίᾳ νικήσας τοὺς ἀνταγωνιστὰς τυγχάνει παρὰ Δαρείου ὠνησάμενος ἀναίωσιν Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ μετὰ "Εσδρά εἰς τὴν πατρίαν γῆν ἀναξίγνυσαι (can only refer to chaps. iii. iv. of the Greek Ezra). Origenes, *Comment. in Johann.* vol. vi. c. 1 (Lommatzsch, i. 174): Καὶ κατὰ τοὺς "Εσδρά χρόνους, οἷς νικᾷ ἡ ἀλήθεια τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸν ἰχθὺν βασιλεία καὶ τὰς γυναικας, ἀνοικοδομεῖται ὁ ναὸς τῷ θεῷ (comp. *Esra graec.* iv. 33 sqq.). Idem, in *Josiam homil.* ix. 10 (Lommatzsch, xi. 100): et nos dicamus, sicut in Esdra scriptum est, quia "a te domine est victoria et ego servus tuus, benedictus es deus veritatis" (*Esra graec.* iv. 59-60). *Cyprian epist.* lxxiv. 9: Et apud Hesdram veritas vicit, sicut scriptum est: "Veritas manet et invalescit in aeternum et vivit et obtinet in saecula saeculorum," etc. (*Esra graec.* iv. 38-40). For numerous passages from later Fathers see Pohlmann, *Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1859, p. 263 sqq. In the authorized editions of the Vulgate, the book is placed in the Appendix to the Bible after the New Testament.

The book is sometimes entitled the *first* Book of Ezra (so the Greek MSS.: "Εσδρας α'), sometimes the *third* Book of Ezra, the canonical Books of Ezra and Nehemiah being reckoned the first and second (so Jerome [*praef. in version. libr. Esrae*, ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1524: nec quemquam moveat, quod, unus a nobis editus liber est; nec apocryphorum tertii et quarti somniis delectetur], and especially the authorized editions of the Vulgate).

Among the Greek *manuscripts* the *Vaticanus* (called No. 2 in Fritzsche's edition, as well as by Holmes and Parsons) and the *Alexandrinus* (No. 3) hold the first rank, the book not being contained in the Sinaiticus. On the editions, see above, pp. 10 and 11.

Ancient translations: 1. The old Latin preserved in two recensions, one of which is found in the manuscripts and

editions of the Vulgate, the other in the *cod. Colbertinus* 3703. Both texts in Sabatier, *Biblicorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. iii. (in the Appendix after the New Testament corresponding to the position in the Vulgate). On the relation of both to one another, see Fritzsche, *Handb.* i. 10. 2. The Syriac, on which comp. p. 11. This book is not contained in the large Milan Peshito manuscripts.

On the exegesis in general, see p. 11. Commentary: Fritzsche, *Exeg. Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, Part i. Leipzig 1851.

Separate investigations: [Trendelenburg] "On the apocryphal Esras" (Eichhorn's *Allg. Biblioth. der bibl. Literatur*, vol. i. 1787, pp. 178-232). Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, vol. ii. (1834) pp. 116-125. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, i. 320 sqq., iii. 72 sqq. Treuenfels, "Ueber das apokryphische Buch Esra" (*Fürst's Literaturbl. des Orient*, 1850, Nos. 15-18, 40-49). The same, "Entstehung des Esra apocryphus" (*Fürst's Orient*, 1851, Nos. 7-10). Pohlmann, "Ueber das Ansehen des apokryphischen dritten Buchs Esras" (*Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1859, pp. 257-275). Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 163-167. Bissell, "The First Book of Esdras" (*Bibliotheca sacra*, 1877, pp. 209-228; reprinted in Bissell, *The Apocrypha of the Old Testament*, 1880, p. 62 sqq., Clark, Edinburgh). The Introductions of Eichhorn, Bertholdt, De Wette-Schrader, Keil, Reuss (see above, p. 12).

2. Additions to Esther.

The canonical Book of Esther relates how a Jewish virgin, a foster-daughter of Mordecai, was chosen for his wife by the Persian king Ahasuerus (Xerxes); how Haman, the prime minister of the king, published a decree in his name for the extirpation of all the Jews, and was already making preparations to hang Mordecai; how Mordecai however, who had formerly saved the king's life, was raised to great honour and Haman hanged on the gibbet destined for Mordecai, whereupon Mordecai by an edict promulgated in the king's name revoked the edict of Haman and gave permission to the Jews to destroy their enemies; and finally, how the Jewish feast of Purim was instituted for the commemoration of this wonderful deliverance of the Jews. A multitude of passages are interpolated in the Greek revision of the book, *e.g.* the edict

of Haman, a prayer of Mordecai and a prayer of Esther, the edict of Mordecai and the like. In these portions the spirit of the narrative is maintained and they present nothing needing remark. There is no reason for adopting the view of a Hebrew model (so *e.g.* Langen). According to the superscription of the Greek edition it was the work of Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemy of Jerusalem, and was brought to Egypt in the fourth year of King Ptolemy and Cleopatra by the priest Dositheus and his son Ptolemy. Since no less than four Ptolemies had a Cleopatra to wife, the information, even if it be regarded as trustworthy, is not of much chronological value. It is certain only that Josephus was already acquainted with the Greek revision with the additions.

Josephus in his reproduction of its contents (*Antt.* xi. 6) has admitted also all the additions of the Greek revision.

Origenes, *Epist. ad African.* c. 3, mentions these additions and expressly names the most important; assuming as self-evident the canonicity of the book in this form (the additions included). He also mentions, *De oratione*, c. 13 (Lommatzsch, xvii. 134), the prayers of Mordecai and Esther inserted between chaps. iv. and v., and gives in the same work, c. 14 (Lommatzsch, xvii. 143), the first words of both prayers.

The Greek text is extant in two widely differing recensions: (1) the common, which is supported by the best manuscripts, the Vaticanus (No. 2), the Alexandrinus (No. 3) and the Sinaiticus (No. 10); and (2) a much retouched one in *codd.* 19, 93, 108 (or more precisely 19, 93^a and 108^b, the last two manuscripts containing both the common and the touched-up texts). Langen thought he could prove that Josephus already had access to the latter. But Josephus chiefly coincides with the common text (comp. *e.g.* the portion, *Esth.* ii. 21–23 = *Joseph. Antt.* xi. 6. 4, which is entirely expunged from the revised text, the name of the eunuch Achmethaios, *Esth.* iv. 5 = *Joseph. Antt.* xi. 6. 4, which is also absent in the revised text and other matters). It has also been rendered very probable by recent investigations, that the revised text is derived from Lucianus (see above, p. 165). If then one or two instances of contact between Josephus and the revised text are really not accidental, this would only prove that the words in question were formerly found in the common text also. Fritzsche published both texts, at first separately (*Ἑσθῆρ, duplicem libri textum*, ed. O. F. Fritzsche, Zurich 1848), then in his edition of the *Libri*

apocryphi Vet. Test. graece (1871). Comp. on the editions, p. 10 above.

Ancient translations. 1. *The Latin.* (a) The old Latin according to a *cod. Corbeiensis* with the various readings of two other manuscripts in Sabatier, *Bibliorum sacrorum Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. i. The beginning of the book, according to the same translation, is also found in *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, vol. i. (1873), *Florileg.* pp. 287-289. On the character of the translation, see Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handb.* i. 74 sq. (b) The translation of Jerome, who, in his translation of the book from the Hebrew, gives also a free Latin version of the Greek additions, but places them all at the end, and marks them with the obelus (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1581: *Quae habentur in Hebraeo, plena fide expressi. Haec autem, quae sequuntur, scripta reperi in editione vulgata, quae Graecorum lingua et literis continetur . . . quod juxta consuetudinem nostram obelo + id est veru praenotavimus*). 2. The Syriac translation, see above, p. 11.

For the exegesis in general, see above, p. 11. Commentary: Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, Part i., Leipzig 1851. The other literature: Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (1832), pp. 120-122. Langen, "Die beiden griechischen Texte des Buches Esther" (*Theol. Quartalschr.* 1860, pp. 244-272). The same, *Die deuterokanonischen Stücke des Buches Esther*, Freiburg 1862. The introductory works of von Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, Nöldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see above, p. 12).

3. Additions to Daniel.

The Greek text of the Book of Daniel contains the following additions: (a) *The Prayer of Azariah and the Thanksgiving of the Three Children in the Furnace.* For when the three companions of Daniel were cast into the furnace (Dan. iii.), one of them, Azariah, who was also called Abed-Nego, first uttered a prayer for deliverance and, when this was heard, all three joined in a song of praise. The words of both are given. (b) *The History of Susannah.* A beautiful Jewess named Susannah, the wife of Jehoiakim, is, while bathing, surprised by two lustful Jewish elders, and then, when she cries for assistance, slanderously accused by them of having committed adultery with a youth. Upon the false

witness of the elders Susannah is condemned to death, but saved by the wisdom of the youthful Daniel, who procures a fresh investigation, and by a skilful examination convicts the elders of perjury. (c) *The History of Bel and the Dragon*. Properly two independent narratives, both of which are intended to expose the worthlessness and imposture of idolatrous worship. In the one, we are told how King Cyrus (so Theodotion, the king's name not being mentioned in the Septuagint text) was convinced by a clever contrivance of Daniel, that the image of Bel did not itself consume the food laid before it. In the other, how Daniel having fed the Dragon, to whom divine honours were paid by the Babylonians, with cakes made of pitch, fat, and hair, and so killed it, was cast into the den of lions, and there miraculously fed by the prophet Habakkuk, and after seven days drawn out of the pit unhurt. Of these fragments only the first (the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children) is properly speaking a completion of the canonical Book of Daniel, the two others having no internal connection with it. In the text of Theodotion *the History of Susannah stands at the commencement of that book, the History of Bel and the Dragon at its close*. This position is also evidenced by the Fathers (Hippolytus, Julius Africanus and Origen). Neither of the fragments gives occasion for assuming a Hebrew original. The History of Susannah is even very certainly a Greek original, as Julius Africanus and Porphyry already showed from the play upon the words *σχινος* and *σχιζειν* (vers. 54, 55), *πιβος* and *πιβειν* (vers. 58, 59) (*African. epist. ad Origen, Porphyry*. quoted by Jerome, *praef. comment. in Daniel*, ed. Vallarsi, 619).¹¹

Specially copious material is in existence for the *history of the use and canonical validity of these fragments in the Christian Church*.

Justin Martyr mentions, *Apol. i.*, Ananias, Azarias and Misael, the three companions of Daniel. But it is not clear from his

¹¹ The Catholic apologists from Origen (*Epist. ad African. c. vi. and xii.*) to Wiederholt (*Theol. Quartalschr.* 1869, pp. 290–321), have in vain endeavoured to do away with the proof furnished by this play upon words.

brief notice of them whether he was also acquainted with the additions.

Irenaeus and Tertullian quote both the History of Susannah and that of Bel and the Dragon. Irenaeus, iv. 26. 3: *audient eas quae sunt a Daniele propheta voces*, etc. (comp. Susanna, vers. 56 and 52, 53 according to Theodotion). Idem, iv. 5. 2: *Quem (Deum) et Daniel propheta, cum dixisset ei Cyrus rex Persarum: "Quare non adoras Bel?" annuntiavit dicens: "Quoniam," etc.* Tertullian, *De corona*, c. iv. (Susanna). Idem, *De idololatria*, c. xviii. (Bel and the Dragon); *de jejunio*, c. vii. *fin.* (the same).

Hippolytus in his commentary on Daniel deals also with the Greek additions. The explanation of the History of Susannah (*Opp.* ed. Lagarde, pp. 145-151) and a few notes on the Song of the Three Children (Lagarde, p. 186, fragm. 122, p. 201, fragm. 138) are extant. It is evident from the beginning of the notes on Susannah, that Hippolytus read this portion as the commencement of the Book of Daniel. See in general, Bardenhewer, *Des heiligen Hippolytus von Rom Commentar zum Buche Daniel*, Freiburg 1877; and Zahn, *Theol. Litztg.* 1877, p. 495 sqq.

Julius Africanus alone among the older Fathers disputes the canonicity of these fragments. In his *Epistola ad Origenem* (printed in the editions of Origen, e.g. in Lommatzsch, xvii. 17 sqq.) he calls Origen to account for appealing in a disputation to the History of Susannah, which is but a spurious addition to Daniel: *Θαυμάζω δὲ, πῶς ἰλαθί σε τὸ μέρος τοῦ βιβλίου τοῦτο κίβδηλον ὄν . . . ἔδε ἡ περιποίησιν σὺν ἄλλαις δύο ταῖς ἐπὶ τῷ τέλει τῷ παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰλημμένῳ Δανιὴλ οὐκ ἰμφοίρεται.* The last remark refers, as appears from the reply of Origen, to the two pieces of Bel and of the Dragon. Hence Africanus read these at the close and the History of Susannah at the beginning of the book.

Origen in his reply (*Epistola ad Africanum*) seeks to defend the genuineness and canonicity of these pieces with a great amount of scholarship.¹² In so doing he mentions, not only the History of Susannah and those of Bel and the Dragon, but also the Prayer of Azariah, and the Song of the Three Children, and indeed speaks of them as standing in the midst of the text of Daniel, remarking that *all three were found both in the LXX. and in the text of Theodotion (Epist. ad African. c. ii.)*. In the tenth book of his *Stromata* he gives an exegesis of the

¹² Wetstein in his separate edition of the letters (*Julii Africani de historia Susannae epistola ad Origenem et Origenis ad illum responsio*, ed. J. R. Wetstenius, Basil. 1674) incorrectly denies that Origen really desired to prove the canonicity of these fragments. See on the contrary the *Monitum* in de la Rue and Lommatzsch.

History of Susannah and that of Bel, from which Jerome makes extracts in his commentary on Daniel, chaps. xiii.-xiv. (Hieron. *Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, v. 730-736; also in Orig. *Opp.* ed. Lommatzsch, xvii. 70-75). All the fragments are elsewhere frequently quoted by Origen, and that according to the text of Theodotion. (1) Susannah, *Comm. in Joann.* vol. xx. c. 5 (Lommatzsch, ii. 204); *ibid.* vol. xxviii. c. 4 (Lommatzsch, ii. 316); *Comm. in Matth.* series lat. c. 61 (Lommatzsch, iv. 347); *Comm. in Epist. ad Rom.* lib. iv. c. 2 (Lommatzsch, vi. 249); *Fragm. in Genes.* vol. iii. c. iv. (Lommatzsch, viii. 13); *in Genes. homil.* xv. 2 (Lommatzsch, viii. 261); *in Josuam homil.* xxii. 6 (Lommatzsch, xi. 190); *Selecta in Psalmos*, Ps. xxxvi. (xxxvii.) *homil.* iv. 2 (Lommatzsch, xii. 210); in Ezekiel, *homil.* vi. 3 (Lommatzsch, xiv. 82); *Selecta in Ezek.* c. 6 (Lommatzsch, xiv. 196). Comp. especially with respect to canonicity in *Levit. homil.* i. 1 (Lommatzsch, ix. 173) against those who adhere to the literal and historical sense of Scripture: sed tempus est nos adversus improbos presbyteros uti sanctae Susannae vocibus, quas illi quidem repudiantes historiam Susannae de catalogo divinorum voluminum desecarunt. Nos autem et suscipimus et opportune contra ipsos proferimus dicentes, "Angustiae mihi undique." (2) Prayer of Azariah and Song of the Three Children: *Comm. in Matth.* vol. xiii. c. 2 (Lommatzsch, iii. 211); *Comm. in Matth.* series lat. c. 62 (Lommatzsch, iv. 352); *Comm. in Epist. ad Rom.* lib. i. c. 10 (Lommatzsch, vi. 37); *ibid.* lib. ii. c. 9 (Lommatzsch, vi. 108); *ibid.* lib. vii. c. 1 (Lommatzsch, vii. 87); *De Oratione*, c. xiii. and xiv. (Lommatzsch, xvii. 134, 143). (3) Bel and the Dragon: *Exhortatio ad martyrium*, c. 33 (Lommatzsch, xx. 278).

Cyprian, *de dominica oratione*, c. 8, adduces the Song of the Three Children as a standard example of publica et communis oratio. Comp. also *De Lapsis*, c. 31. He quotes the story of Bel, *ad Fortunatum*, c. 11; and *Epist.* lviii. 5.

The Greek text used by the Fathers since Irenaeus was that of Theodotion, which has also passed into the manuscripts and editions of the LXX. (see above, p. 173). The genuine Septuagint text of Daniel is preserved to us in only one manuscript, a cod. *Chisianus*; and after the previous labours of others (Bianchini and Vincentius, *de Regibus*, see *Theol. Lititzg.* 1877, p. 565) has been published for the first time by Simon de Magistris (*Daniel secundum LXX. ex tetraplis Origenis nunc primum editus e singulari Chisiano codice*, Rom. 1772). On this edition, which is not free from errors, are based the more recent ones, and also that of Hahn (*Δανιήλ κατὰ τοὺς ἰσδομένης*, e cod. *Chisiano* ed. etc., H. A. Hahn, Lips. 1845). Still more incorrect is the text, in part formed from Holmes and Parsons'

Apparatus of Various Readings, which Tischendorf has added to his edition of the Septuagint. It is to Cozza (*Sacrorum Bibliorum vetustissima fragmenta Graeca et Latina*, ed. Cozza, pars iii. Romae 1877; comp. the notice of Gebhardt, *Theol. Litztg.* 1877, p. 565 sq.) that we are first indebted for a trustworthy impression of the MSS. *The Syriac translation of the hexaplarian LXX. text*, of which Daniel and other books have been preserved in a Milan manuscript, serves as a check and criticism of the *cod. Chisianus*. The Book of Daniel from this translation has already been published by Bugati (*Daniel secundum editionem LXX. interpretum ex Tetraplis desumptam, ex codice Syro-Estranghelo Bibliothecae Ambrosianae Syriace edidit*, etc., Caj. Bugatus, Mediol. 1788). A photo-lithographic copy of the whole manuscript has been published by Ceriani (*Codex Syro-Hexaplaris Ambrosianus photolithographice editus*, Mediol. 1874, as vol. vii. of the *Monum. sacra et prof.*). Fritzsche in his edition of the Apocrypha, gives both the Greek texts (LXX. and Theodotion) of Susannah, Bel and the Dragon, and the Septuagint only, with the various readings of Theodotion, of the Prayer of Azarias, and the Song of the Three Children, in which Theodotion has made but few alterations. Comp. on the editions of the Greek text (*i.e.* of Theodotion), p. 10 above.

Ancient translations. A *Vetus Latinus*, only fragmentary in Sabatier, *Biblior. sacror. Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. ii. The Greek original is Theodotion. Jerome has likewise translated the Greek additions from Theodotion and admitted them, marked with the obelus, into his translation of Daniel from the Hebrew. See his remarks, ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1376, 1399. On the editions of the Syriac common text, see above, p. 11. The Syriac translation of the Story of Bel and the Dragon, from a collection of Midrashim, is also found in Neubauer, *The Book of Tobit*, 1878, pp. 39-43.

For the exegesis in general, see above, p. 11. Commentary: Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apocryphen*, Pt. i. Leipzig 1851. The other literature: Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (1832), p. 122 sq. Delitzsch, *De Habacuci prophetae vita atque aetate* (Lips. 1842), pp. 23 sqq., 105 sqq. Frankel, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1868, pp. 440-449 (on Susannah). Wiederholt, *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1869, pp. 287 sqq., 377 sqq. (History of Susannah); 1871, p. 373 sqq. (Prayer of Azarias and Song of the Three Children); 1872, p. 554 sqq. (Bel and the Dragon). Rohling, *Das Buch des Propheten Daniel*, 1876. Brüll, "Das apokryphische Susannabuch" (*Jahrb. für jüd. Gesch. und Literatur*, Pt. iii. 1877, pp. 1-69; also separate). The Introductions of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz,

Nöldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see above, p. 12).

4. *The Prayer of Manasseh.*

In like manner as the prayers of Mordecai and Esther were interpolated as supplements to the Book of Esther, and the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children to that of Daniel, so was a prayer of Manasseh, in which the king in his captivity humbly confesses his sin before God and prays for pardon, composed as a completion of 2 Chron. xxxiii. 12, 13. There was the more occasion for the composition of such a prayer, since it is stated in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 18, 19, that the Prayer of Manasseh is written in the history of the kings of Israel and in the Chronicle of Hosai. The prayer stands in most manuscripts in the appendix to the Psalms, where many other similar fragments are collected (so e.g. in the *cod. Alexandrinus*).

The Prayer is first *quoted* in the *Constitut. apostol.* ii. 22, where it is given in its literal entirety. For later Christian testimony to its canonicity, see Fabricius, *Biblioth. Graec.* ed. Harles, iii. 732 sq. In the authorized Romish Vulgate it is in the appendix to the Bible, after the New Testament (like 3 and 4 Ezra).

The Latin translation, which has passed into the Vulgate, is "of quite another kind from the usual old Latin, and is certainly of more recent origin" (Fritzsche, i. 159). Sabatier has compared three manuscripts for it (*Biblior. sacror. Lat. vers. ant.* iii. 1038 sq.).

The editions and the exegesis are the same as of the other Apocrypha. Commentary: Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handbuch zu den Apocryphen*, Pt. i. Leipzig 1851.

For other legends (Jewish and Christian) with respect to Manasseh, see Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 1100-1102. Id. *Biblioth. gr.* ed. Harl. iii. 732 sq. Fritzsche, *Handb.* i. 158.

5. *The Book of Baruch.*

The Greek Book of Baruch properly belongs to the class of Pseudepigraphic prophets, and is distinguished among them by its very meritorious contents. We place it here as being,

at least according to its second half, of Graeco-Jewish origin, and as having been admitted into the Greek Bible as a canonical book.

The whole claims to be the composition of Baruch, the confidential friend and companion of the prophet Jeremiah. Its contents are tolerably miscellaneous, and are divided into two halves, the second of which again comprises two sections. The first half (chaps. i. 1-iii. 8) begins with a superscription, in which what follows is described as a Book of Baruch, which he wrote in the fifth year after the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans (i. 1, 2). This book was read by Baruch before King Jeconiah and all the exiles in Babylon; and the reading produced such an impression, that it was resolved to send money to Jerusalem, that sacrifices and prayers might there be offered for King Nebuchadnezzar and his son Belshazzar. At the same time the Jews dwelling in Jerusalem were enjoined to read out in the temple on the feast days the writing therewith sent (i. 3-14). This writing, which is next given in full, is evidently identical with that read by Baruch, and therefore announced in the superscription.¹³ It is *an ample confession of sin on the part of the exiles*, who recognise in the fearful fate which has overtaken themselves and the holy city, the righteous chastisement of God for their sins, and entreat Him again to show them favour. They confess especially that their disobedience to the King of Babylon was a rebellion against God Himself, because it was His will that Israel should obey the King of Babylon (ii. 21-24). The second half of the book (chaps. iii. 9-v. 9) contains *instruction and consolation for the humbled people*: (a) Instruction—Israel is humbled, because they have forsaken

¹³ The writing announced in the superscription and read by Baruch cannot, as many critics suppose, be chap. iii. 7 sqq. For the effect of the reading is, that a sacrifice for Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar is resolved upon, and this can only refer to chap. ii. 21-24. The superscription i. 1, 2, too, is by no means in accordance with iii. 9 sqq., this latter section giving no kind of hint of its having been written by Baruch. Comp. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments*, § 510.

the source of wisdom. True wisdom is with God alone. To it must the people return (iii. 9–iv. 4). (b) Consolation—Jerusalem is not laid waste for ever, nor are the people to be always in captivity. They must take courage, for the scattered members shall again be assembled in the Holy Land (iv. 5–v. 9).

The second half is joined to the first without any intervening matter at chap. iii. 9. An internal connection only so far exists, that both halves presuppose the same historical situation, viz. the desolation of Jerusalem and the carrying away of the people into captivity. In other respects however they stand in no connection with each other, and it is hardly conceivable that they formed from the first part of the same whole. To this must be added, that the style and mode of expression widely differ, being in the first half Hebraistic, and in the second fluent and rhetorical Greek. Hence Fritzsche, Hitzig, Kneucker, Hilgenfeld and Reuss have correctly inferred, that the two halves are the works of different authors. Nay, one might feel inclined, with Hitzig, Kneucker and Hilgenfeld, to regard even the first half as no single work, but to look upon chap. i. 3–14 as a later interpolation. For it cannot be denied that the narrative of the reading of the Book of Baruch and of the effect produced thereby, comes in like an interruption between i. 1, 2 and i. 15–iii. 8. After the superscription i. 1, 2, the book itself is expected. A discrepancy of statement also ensues owing to the inserted narrative, the destruction of the temple being assumed by the book itself (i. 2, ii. 26), and the continuance of the sacrificial service by the narrative (i. 10–14). But lastly, all these inconsistencies are possible in one and the same author; and other matters, such especially as the like dependence on Daniel in i. 11, 12 and i. 15–ii. 20 favour identity of authorship.

Most of the older critics adopt the view of a Hebrew original for the whole; and Kneucker, in spite of his assumption of three different composers, firmly maintains it, nay,

tries with much care to reconstruct the Hebrew original. There are however sufficient points of contact for this *in the first half only*. The second half is evidently a Greek original. Hence we are constrained, with Fritzsche, Hilgenfeld and Reuss, to admit, concerning the origin of this book, that its first half was originally composed in Hebrew, then translated into Greek, and completed by the addition of the second half.

In determining the *date of its composition*, its close dependence on the Book of Daniel is decisive. There are in it correspondences with the latter, which make the employment of it by the author of Baruch indubitable. Especially is there an almost verbal agreement between Dan. ix. 7-10 and Baruch i. 15-18. The juxtaposition too of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar is common to both books (Dan. v. 2 sqq. = Baruch i. 11, 12). That so thoroughly original and creative a mind however as the author of the Book of Daniel should have copied from the Book of Baruch is certainly not to be admitted. Thus we have already arrived at the Maccabaeen period, and most Protestant critics stop there (so *e.g.* Fritzsche, Schrader, Keil). But the situation assumed in the Book of Baruch by no means agrees with the Maccabaeen era. The Book of Baruch, and especially its first half, with which we are first of all concerned, *presupposes* the destruction of Jerusalem and the leading of the people into captivity (i. 2, ii. 23, 26). In this catastrophe the people recognise a judgment of God for their sins, and particularly for their rebellion against the heathen authority, which God Himself had set over Israel (ii. 21-24). The penitent people hasten therefore to order sacrifices and prayers for their heathen rulers (i. 10, 11). All this—as the destruction by the Chaldeans is out of question—only suits the time *after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus*. This very catastrophe was moreover brought about by the rebellion of the people against the heathen authorities. And the special act of rebellion was, as Josephus expressly states, the doing away with the daily sacrifice for the Roman

emperor (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 2-4; comp. above, Div. ii. vol. i. p. 302 sq.). In this political revolution our author saw a rebellion against the will of God, and therefore in the fearful catastrophe, the righteous judgment of God upon it. And he sought, by all he relates of the exiles in the time of Baruch, to bring this view to bear upon his fellow-countrymen. It must therefore certainly be admitted, as by Hitzig and Kneucker, that this book was written after the year A.D. 70. For the quite non-historical juxtaposition of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar, recalling the relation of Vespasian and Titus, also agrees with that date. The narrative that in the straits of war parents ate the flesh of their children (ii. 3) frequently recurs indeed in the description of the horrors of war, but is also found just in the description of the siege of A.D. 70 by Josephus (*Bell. Jud.* vi. 3. 4).

What has been said applies chiefly to only the first half of the book. But the second half also essentially assumes the same situation, viz. the desolation of Jerusalem and the leading of the people into captivity (iv. 10-16). Its object is to give instruction and consolation in view of these events. Hence its composition cannot well be placed much later than that of the first half. At all events this second half is later than the Salomonian Psalter. For Baruch v. agrees almost verbally with Psalt. Salom. xi.; and the dependence must, by reason of the psalm-like character and the probably primitive Hebrew of the Salomonian Psalter, be sought for on the side of the Book of Baruch.

The fact that it found acceptance in the Christian Church is not opposed to our conclusion as to the somewhat recent composition of the book. For exactly the same thing took place in the case of the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra.

The existence of a Hebrew text of this book is disputed by Jerome, see *praef. comment. in Jerem.* (Vallarsi, iv. 834): *Libellum autem Baruch, qui vulgo editioni Septuaginta copulatur nec habetur apud Hebraeos. Idem, praef. in version.*

Jerem. (Vallarsi, ix. 783): Librum autem Baruch notarii ejus, qui apud Hebraeos nec legitur nec habetur. So too Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, § 5: τῶν θρῆνων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν Βαρούχ, εἰ καὶ οὐ κηρύσσεται ἐπιστολαὶ παρ' Ἑβραίοις. But both Jerome and Epiphanius for the most part try only to prove that the book was not in the Hebrew canon. Certainly they seem to have known of no Hebrew text at all, but that does not prove that none ever existed. For its existence may be cited the remark found three times in the Milan manuscript of the *Syrus hexaplaris* (on i. 17 and ii. 3), "this is not in the Hebrew" (see Ceriani's notes to his edition in the *Monum. sacra et prof.* i. 1, 1861).

Among the Jews (*i.e.* among the Hellenistic Jews?) this book, together with the Lamentations of Jeremiah, was, according to the testimony of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, read at public worship on the 10th Gorpaios (by which is certainly meant the 10th Ab, the day of the destruction of Jerusalem), *Const. apost.* v. 20: καὶ γὰρ καὶ νῦν δεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς Γορπαιῶν συναθροίζονται τοὺς θρῆνους Ἰερემίου ἀναγινώσκουσιν . . . καὶ τὸν Βαρούχ. In the Syriac text of the *Const. apost.* the Book of Baruch, it is true, is not named. See Bunsen, *Analecta Antea-Nicaena*, ii. 187. On the date of the 10th Gorpaios, comp. also Freudenthal, *Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft* (1869), p. 147 sq.

On its use in the Christian Church, see the copious proofs in Reusch, *Erklärung des Buch's Baruch* (1853), pp. 1-21 and 268 sqq. The book is very frequently quoted as a *work of the prophet Jeremiah*, because it was from early times combined with his book. The passage concerning the appearance of God upon earth (Bar. iii. 37: μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ὤφθη καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναστράφη), which Kneucker rightly regards as a Christian gloss, was a favourite one with the Fathers. The oldest quotation is in Athenagoras, *Suppl.* c. 9, where Bar. iii. 35 is cited as the saying of a προφήτης. Irenaeus, iv. 20, refers to Bar. iii. 37. He also quotes (v. 35. 1) Bar. iv. 36 to v. *fin.* with the formula, significavit Jeremias propheta dicens. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Paedag.* i. 10. 91, 92, quotes various passages of this book as sayings of the prophet Jeremiah. In *Paedag.* ii. 3. 36 he quotes Bar. iii. 16-19 with the formula ἡ θεία σου λίγει γραφή. Hippolytus mentions in his work *Contra Noetum*, that Noetus and his followers appealed to Bar. iii. 35-37, among other passages, in proof of their patripassian Christology (*Hippol.* ed. Lagarde, p. 44). He then, to help himself out of difficulty, himself gives (ed. Lagarde, p. 47) a very sophistical interpretation of the passage. Hence the book is for Hippolytus as well as Noetus a standard

authority. Origenes, in *Jerem. homil.* vii. 3 (Lommatzsch, xv. 190): γέγραπται "ἄκουε Ἰσραὴλ κ.τ.λ." = Bar. iii. 9-13. Idem, *Selecta in Jerem.* c. 31 (Lommatzsch, xv. 456): γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Βαρούχ· "τί ὅτι ἐν γῇ κ.τ.λ." = Bar. iii. 10. Commodian. *Carmen apologet.* (ed. Ludwig) vers. 367, 368: Hieremias ait: Hic deus est, etc. = Bar. iii. 35-37. Cyprian. *Testim.* ii. 6: Item apud Hieremiam prophetam: Hic deus noster, etc. = Bar. iii. 35-37. Material from later Fathers will be found in Reusch as above quoted, to which need only be added *Altercatio Simonis Judaei et Theophili Christiani*, ed. Harnack, p. 17 (in Gebhardt and Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. i. No. 3, 1883).

Among the *Greek manuscripts* the most important are: the *Vaticanus* (which however, not having been collated for this book by Holmes and Parsons, has also been paid no regard to in Fritzsche's edition), the *Alexandrinus* (No. iii. in Holmes and Parsons) and the *Marchalianus* (No. xii.). The Sinaiticus does not contain the Book of Baruch. On the editions, see above, p. 10.

Ancient translations. 1. The Latin which is extant in two widely differing recensions: (a) that which has passed into the Vulgate, and (b) one first published by Joseph Caro, Rome 1688. The latter according to three MSS. in Sabatier, *Biblior. sacror. Latinae versiones antiquae*, vol. ii. p. 734 sqq. Also in *Bibliotheca Casinensis*, vol. i. (1873), *Florileg.* pp. 284-287. On the relation of the two to each other, see Fritzsche, *Handb.* i. 175. Reusch, *Erklärung des Buchs Baruch*, p. 88 sq. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch*, p. 157 sqq. 2. The two *Syriac translations*, (a) the *Peshito* or the Syriac common text, comp. above, p. 11. (b) The *Syrus hexaplaris*, contained for this book in the Milan manuscript of the *Syrus hexaplaris*. The Book of Baruch with the letter of Jeremiah of this MS. were first published by Ceriani (*Monumenta sacra et profana*, vol. i. fasc. i. 1861). Also in the photo-lithographic copy of the entire manuscript, see above, p. 187. 3. A Coptic translation published by Brugsch (*Zeitschr. für ägyptische Sprache und Alterthumskunde*, 10-12th year, 1872-1874, comp. 1876, p. 148).

The exegesis in general, see above, p. 11. Commentaries: Fritzsche, *Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokryphen*, Part i. Leipzig 1851. Reusch, *Erklärung des Buchs Baruch*, Freiburg 1853. Ewald, *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes*, vol. iii. (2nd ed. 1868), pp. 251-298. Kneucker, *Das Buch Baruch, Geschichte und Kritik, Uebersetzung und Erklärung*, Leipzig 1879. The other literature: Hävernicks, *De libro Baruchi apocrypho comm. crit.* Regim. 1843. Hitzig, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1860, pp. 262-273. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iv. (1864) p. 265 sqq. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* vol.

v. 1862, pp. 199-203; xxii. 1879, pp. 437-454; xxiii. 1880, pp. 412-422. Kneucker, the same periodical, 1880, pp. 309-323. The Introductions of Jahne, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see above, p. 12).

6. *The Letter of Jeremiah.*

The letter of Jeremiah, which is said to have been written to the exiles destined to be led away to Babylon, is a *warning against idolatry*, turning upon the theme, that images of wood, silver and gold, are the weak, powerless and perishable creatures of man's hand, which can absolutely do neither good nor harm. The author seeks by these particulars to restrain his co-religionists in the Dispersion from all participation in heathen rites. This small fragment is certainly of Greek origin.

Many have seen in the passage 2 Macc. i. 1 sqq. a *reference to this letter*. But what is there said does not actually suit it. When Origen asserts, that the Lamentations and "the letter" also were combined in the Hebrew canon with the Book of Jeremiah (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 25. 2: 'Ιερουμίας σὺν θρήνοις καὶ τῇ πιστολῇ ἐν αὐτῷ), this certainly rests upon an oversight. Origen only means to say, that the writings of Jeremiah were reckoned by the Jews as *one*, so that the number twenty-two is consequently that of the collected books of Holy Scripture. *Christian quotations*: Tertullian, *Scorpiace*, c. 8. Cyprian, *De dominica oratione*, c. 5, and later writers.

In the majority of editions and manuscripts, the letter is appended to the Book of Baruch (in the Vulgate as its sixth chapter). Hence what has been said of manuscripts, editions, ancient translations and exegesis with respect to that book applies almost throughout in this case.

III. HISTORICAL LITERATURE.

The literary productions as yet discussed are in part compilations, in part imitations of older scriptural works. Hence there is but little specifically "Hellenistic" to be observed in them. The peculiarity of Judæo-Hellenistic literature is apparent in an entirely different manner in

those works, which incline in form towards non-scriptural Greek models and are thus found in the department of historical, poetic and philosophic literature. And first for the historical. Pharisaic Judaism as such had scarcely an interest in history. It saw in history merely an instruction, a warning, how God ought to be served. Hellenistic Judaism was certainly in a far higher degree interested in history as such. A knowledge of the history of the past formed part of the culture of the times. And no people could lay claim to be reckoned among the civilised nations, unless they could point to an old and imposing history. Even nations hitherto regarded as barbarian now compiled their histories and clad them in Greek garments for the purpose of making them accessible to the entire cultured world. The Hellenistic Jews also took their part in such efforts. They too worked up their sacred history for the instruction of both their own fellow-countrymen and the non-Jewish world. The most comprehensive work of the kind, with which we are acquainted, is the great historical work of Josephus. He had however a series of predecessors, who laboured some upon longer, some upon shorter periods of Jewish history in various forms. Of these some set to work in modest annalistic manner (Demetrius), some with fantastic and legendary embellishments *in majorem Judaeorum gloriam* (Eupolemus, Artapanus), while some sought in a philosophical manner to represent the great Jewish lawgiver as the greatest of philosophers, nay as the father of all philosophy (Philo). But the Greek Jews occupied themselves not only with the older Jewish history, but also depicted—as Pharisaic Judaism had ceased to do—important occurrences, which they had as contemporaries experienced, for the purpose of transmitting them to posterity (Jason of Cyrene, Philo, Josephus, Justus of Tiberias). Many who carried on authorship as a vocation were active in both departments. We therefore here place together historical works of both kinds, viz. compilations of the older sacred history and delineations of contemporary events.

The most ancient of these Judaeo-Hellenistic historians have been only rescued from utter oblivion by Alexander Polyhistor. This voluminous writer, who lived about the years 80–40 B.C. (according to the statements of Suidas, *Lcx. s.v.* 'Αλέξανδρος, and Sueton. *De gramm.* c. 20, comp. Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 206, and Unger, *Philologus*, 1884, p. 528 sqq.), composed among other works one *περὶ Ἰουδαίων*, in which he strung together, apparently with scarcely any additions of his own, extracts from foreign authors concerning the Jews. Eusebius in his turn embodied in his *Præparatio evangelica* (ix. 17–39) a large portion of this collection of extracts. And it is to this circumstance, that we are almost entirely indebted for our acquaintance with the oldest Judaeo-Hellenistic and Samaritan compilations of scriptural history whether in poetic or prosaic form, with those of Demetrius, Eupolemus, Artapanus, Aristeeas, Kleodemus, Philo, Theodotus and Ezekiel. Besides Eusebius, Clemens Alexandrinus also once quotes Alexander's work *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* (*Strom.* i. 21. 130); and he undoubtedly makes use of it, even when he quotes Demetrius, Philo, Eupolemus, Artapanus and Ezekiel, from whom Alexander gives extracts (*Strom.* i. 21. 141, 23. 153–156). The quotation also in Josephus, *Antt.* i. 15, is certainly derived from the work *περὶ Ἰουδαίων*, with which Josephus elsewhere betrays his acquaintance (*contra Apion.* i. 23, and various traces in the *Antiquities*). But this is all that is preserved of independent quotation from Alexander's work. The extracts in Eusebius are in chronological order. They begin with fragments on the history of Abraham from Eupolemus, Artapanus, Molon, Philo, Kleodemus. Then follow portions on the history of Jacob from Demetrius and Theodotus, then others on Joseph from Artapanus and Philo. That this order is not first derived from Eusebius, but was followed by Alexander Polyhistor, is shown by the nature of the text. For the single portions are joined together by the connecting words of Alexander himself.

This is moreover confirmed by a comparison of the quotations in Clemens Alexandrinus. For as in Eusebius so in Clemens Alexandrinus the extracts on the history of Moses follow each other in direct succession:—

Eupolemus = Euseb. ix. 26 = Clemens, *Str.* i. 23. 153.

Artapanus = Euseb. ix. 27 = Clemens, *Str.* i. 23. 154.

Ezekiel = Euseb. ix. 28 = Clemens, *Str.* i. 23. 155, 156.

Hence we see that this is the original order of Alexander Polyhistor. The genuineness of Alexander's work has of late been frequently disputed, especially by Rauch and Cruice. It is thought inconceivable, that a heathen author like Alexander should have had so special an interest in Jewish affairs; it is also thought strange that he should call the Old Testament Scriptures *ἱερὰ βιβλία* (Euseb. ix. 24, 29. 15), and that he should here give such detailed accounts of Jewish history, while he elsewhere betrays the strangest ignorance of it. Its genuineness has been defended against these objections by Hulleman (p. 156 sq.), Müller (*Fragm.* iii. 209), and especially with convincing proofs by Freudenthal (pp. 174–184). The question is moreover one of minor importance, since it is tolerably indifferent whether these extracts were collected by Alexander or by some one else; for in either case the extraordinary differences in form and contents existing in these fragments is a guarantee, that we have here to deal with extracts from works then actually existing and not with the single work of a forger. Only the determination of the date would be affected, if it could be really proved, that the collection was not the production of Alexander Polyhistor, inasmuch as the time of Alexander would then cease to be a limit. The fragments in themselves furnish no cause for relegating them to a later date. For the most recent of the authors, from whom the extracts are made, and whose date can be determined independently of Alexander, is Apollonius Molon (Euseb. ix. 19), a Greek orator of probably about 120–100 B.C. (see No. VI. below).

References to Jewish affairs are also found in other works of Alexander Polyhistor. He quotes the Jewish Sibyl in his Chaldaean ancient history (Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schöne, i. 23. Cyrill. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanh. p. 9^c. Syncell. ed. Dindorf, i. 81. Comp. Joseph. *Antt.* i. 4. 3; Freudenthal, p. 25 sq.). In his work on Italy is found the odd assertion, that the Jewish law was derived from a female named Moso (Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* 'Αλέξανδρος. Müller, *Fragm.* n. 25); and to his work on Syria belongs probably the information that Judaea received its name from Juda and Idumaea, the children of Semiramis (Steph. *Byz. s.v.* 'Ιουδαία. Müller, *Fragm.* n. 98-102). It is just these strange statements which have given rise to the denial of Alexander's authorship of the work *περί 'Ιουδαίων*—but very incorrectly, for he simply copied what he found in his authorities. Consequently, according to their nature, his information is now correct now incorrect. It rests upon only a somewhat wanton combination, when the pseudo-Justinian *Cohort. ad Graec.* c. 9 ascribes also to Alexander a statement concerning the date of Moses (see my article on "Julius Africanus as the source of the pseudo-Justinian *Cohortatio ad Graecos*," in Brieger's *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* vol. ii. 1878, p. 319 sqq.).

The text of the fragment *περί 'Ιουδαίων* is in Euseb. *Evangelicae Praeparationis libri*, xv. ed. Gaisford, 4 vols. Oxford 1843. Clementis Alex. *Opera*, ed. Dindorf, 4 vols. Oxford 1869. Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, vol. iii. pp. 211-230. The prose fragments, partly according to a recent collation of manuscripts, are best given in Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyhistor*, pp. 219-236. On the manuscripts and editions of Eusebius, see Freudenthal, pp. 199-202.

Comp. in general: Rauch, *De Alexandri Polyhistoris vita atque scriptis*, Heidelb. 1843, quoted by Müller and others as "Rumpf." Cruice, *De Fl. Josephi in auctoribus contra Apionem afferendis fide et auctoritate* (Paris 1844), pp. 20-30. Hulleman, "De Corn. Alexandro Polyhistore" (*Miscellanea philologica et paedagoga edd. gymnasiorum Batavorum doctores*, vol. i. 1849, pp. 87-178). C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 206-244. Vaillant, *De historicis qui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere, nempe Aristeo, Demetrio, Eupolemo, Hecataeo Abderita, Cleodemo, Artapano, Justo Tiberiensi, Cornelio Alexandro Polyhistore* (Paris 1851, Didot), pp. 88-98 (a follower of Cruice). Creuzer, *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1853, p. 76 sqq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 570 sqq. Westermann in Pauly's *Real-Enc. der class. Alterthums-wissensch.* i. 1 (2nd ed. 1864), p. 734 sq. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*, Bresl.

1875. Reuss, *Gesch. der heiligen Schriften A. T.'s* (1881), § 520, 521. Unger, "Wann schrieb Alexander Polyhistor?" (*Philologus*, vol. xliii. 1884, pp. 528-531).

1. *Demetrius.*

In the same century in which Berosus composed the ancient history of the Chaldaeans, and Manetho that of the Egyptians, but about sixty years later, Demetrius, a Jewish Hellenist, compiled in a brief chronological form a history of Israel, his work being equally with theirs according to the sacred records. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 141 states its title to have been *περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων*. And it can be scarcely a reason for doubting the correctness of this title, that the fragments deal almost all with only the most ancient period (so Freudenthal, p. 205 sq.). For Justus of Tiberias *e.g.* also treated of the time of Moses in his Chronicle of the Jewish kings. The first fragment in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 21 concerns the history of Jacob from his emigration to Mesopotamia till his death. At the close the genealogy of the tribe of Levi is carried on to the birth of Moses and Aaron. Chronology is made a special aim. Nay, the whole is far more a settlement of chronology than a history properly so called. The date of every single circumstance in the life of Laban, *e.g.* the birth of each of his twelve sons and such matters, is precisely determined. Of course many dates have to be assumed for which Scripture offers no support. A large portion of the chronological statements is obtained by combinations, and in some instances very complicated combinations of actual dates of Holy Scripture. A second fragment (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 29. 1-3) from the history of Moses is chiefly occupied in proving, that Zipporah the wife of Moses was descended from Abraham and Keturah. This fragment is also used in the *Chronicon paschale*, ed. Dindorf, i. 117, and is quoted from Eusebius in the *Chron. Anon.* in Cramer, *Anecdota*, Paris, ii. 256. In a third (Euseb. *Praep.*

evang. ix. 29. 15) the history of the bitter waters (*Ex.* xv. 22 sqq.) is related. Lastly, the chronological fragment preserved in *Clem. Alex. Strom.* i. 21. 141 gives precise statements concerning the length of time from the carrying away into captivity of the ten tribes and the tribes of Judah and Benjamin to Ptolemy IV. It is just this fragment which gives us also a key to the date of Demetrius. For it is evident that he chose the time of Ptolemy IV. (222–205 B.C.) as a closing point for his calculations, because he himself lived in the reign of that monarch. Hence we obtain also an important standpoint for determining the date of the LXX. For that Demetrius made use of the Septuagint translation of the Pentateuch is acknowledged even by Hody, although such acknowledgment is unfavourable to his tendency of pointing out the limited diffusion obtained by the LXX. A glance at the contents of the fragment renders it needless to prove that *its author was a Jew*. It would certainly never have entered the mind of a heathen to take such pains in calculating and completing the Biblical chronology. Nevertheless Josephus took him for one and confounded him with Demetrius Phalereus (*Contra Apion.* i. 23 = *Euseb. Praep. evang.* ix. 42; comp. Müller, *Fragm.* ii. 369^a. Freudenthal, p. 170, note). Among moderns too, *e.g.* Hody, is found the mistaken notion that he was a heathen. The correct one is however already met with in Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* vi. 13. 7, and after him in Hieronymus, *De vir. illustr.* c. 38 (ed. Vallarsi, ii. 879).

Clemens Alex. Strom. i. 21. 141: Δημήτριος δὲ φησιν ἐν τῇ περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλείῳ τὴν Ἰούδα φυλὴν καὶ Βενιαμὴν καὶ Λευὶ μὴ αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Συναχρεῖμ, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἀπὸ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας ταύτης εἰς τὴν ἰσχάτην, ἣν ἐποιήσατο Ναβουχοδονόσορ ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων, ἔτη ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ὀκτὼ μῆνας ἐξ. ἀφ' οὗ δὲ αἱ φυλαὶ αἱ δέκα ἐκ Σαμαρείας αἰχμαλῶτοι γεγόνασιν ἕως Πτολεμαίου τετάρτου [B.C. 222] ἔτη πεντακλίσια ἰβδομήκοντα τρία μῆνας ἑνέα, ἀφ' οὗ δὲ ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἔτη τριακλίσια τριάκοντα ὀκτὼ μῆνας τρεῖς. The text of this fragment is in many instances corrupt. 1. It is impossible that Demetrius, with his minute accuracy in scriptural chronology, could have reckoned from 573–338, *i.e.* 235 years from the carrying away of the ten tribes to the carrying away of the tribes of Benjamin

and Judah, when the interval amounts to about a hundred years less. Hence the number 573 must either be reduced, or that of 338 increased, by one hundred. The latter is undoubtedly correct, since it may be shown, that other ancient chronologists have made the post-exilian period too long (see above on Daniel, p. 54). If Demetrius therefore put down about seventy years too much for this time, there is for just this reason utterly no motive for doing away with this mistake by altering "Ptolemy IV." into "Ptolemy VII." For even in the accurate Demetrius such a mistake concerning the length of the post-exilian period cannot seem surprising, since the scriptural figures here leave him in the lurch. 2. By abbreviation of the text arose the absurdity that an *αἰχμαλωτισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Σινναχηριμ* is first denied, and then that this *αἰχμαλωσία* is computed from. The thought of the original text undoubtedly is, that the tribes of Judah and Benjamin were not made captives, but only laid under contribution, by Sennacherib; and that 120 years elapsed between this pillaging expedition of Sennacherib and the carrying away of Judah and Benjamin. With this computation it best agrees, that from the carrying away of the ten tribes to that of Judah and Benjamin $573 - 438 = 135$ years are reckoned. For the carrying away of the ten tribes by Shalmanezar actually took place about seven or eight years *before* Sennacherib's attack upon Judah (2 Kings xviii. 9-13).

Comp. in general: Vigerus' *Anmerkungen* to his edition of the *Praep. evang.* of Eusebius (1628). Huetius, *Demonstr. evang.* (5th ed. Lips. 1703) Prop. iv. c. 2, § 22, 30. Hody, *De bibl. textibus* (1705), p. 107. Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, p. 18. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Rel.-Phil.* ii. 220 sq. Cruice, *De Fl. Josephi fide* (1844), pp. 53-58. C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 207 sqq. Vaillant, *De historicis qui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere* (Paris 1851), pp. 45-52. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 486-488, 575 sq. M. Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assur's und Babel's* (1857), pp. 101-104. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor* (1875), pp. 35-82, 205 sqq., 219 sqq. Mendelssohn, *Anzeige Freudenthal's in der Jenaer, Lit.-Ztg.* 1885, No. 6. Siegfried, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875, p. 475. Gutschmid, *Jahrb. für Protestant. Theol.* 1875, p. 744 sqq. Grätz, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth.* 1877, p. 68 sqq. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Fl. Josephus* (1879), p. 56 sqq.

2. *Eupolemus.*

In place of the dry chronological computations of Demetrius, we find in Eupolemus a chequered narrative which freely handles the scriptural history and further embellishes it with all kinds of additions. Formerly *three* different works of this writer were spoken of: 1. *Περὶ τῶν τῆς Ἀσσυρίας Ἰουδαίων*; 2. *Περὶ τῆς Ἡλίου προφητείας*; and 3. *Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων* (so Kuhlmeier, p. 3). The first of these falls away, because in the fragment in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 17: *Εὐπόλεμος δὲ ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδαίων τῆς Ἀσσυρίας φησὶ πάλιν Βαβυλῶνα πρῶτον μὲν κτισθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν κ.τ.λ.*, the words *τῆς Ἀσσυρίας* certainly refer to what follows (Rauch, p. 21; Freudenthal, p. 207). The title *περὶ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ βασιλέων* is certified by Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 153. To this work also undoubtedly belongs the fragment referring to the history of David and Solomon in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 30-34, which Alexander Polyhistor asserts that he took from a work *περὶ τῆς Ἡλίου προφητείας* (Freudenthal, p. 208). Thus we in truth obtain only one work instead of the supposed three. The first fragment (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 17) probably does not belong to Eupolemus at all (comp. hereon No. 6 below); a second almost verbally identical in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 26, and Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 153, represents Moses as the "first sage," who transmitted to the Jews the art of alphabetical writing, which was then handed on by the Jews to the Phoenicians, and by the latter to the Hellenes. The *Chronicon paschale*, ed. Dindorf, i. 117, also has this fragment from Eusebius, and Cyrillus Alex. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanh. p. 231^d, has it from Clement. The long passage in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 30-34 refers to the history of David and Solomon. It commences with a summary of chronology from Moses to David, then briefly relates the chief events of the history of David (Euseb. ix. 30), and then gives a corre-

spondence between Solomon and the kings Uaphres of Egypt and Suron of Phoenicia about assistance in the building of the temple (Euseb. ix. 31-34; comp. Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 130; *Chron. pasch.* ed. Dind. i. 168); and lastly describes in detail the building of the temple (Euseb. ix. 34). The correspondence with Suron = Hiram is taken from 2 Chron. ii. 2, 15, comp. 1 Kings v. 15-25; and that with Uaphres freely imitated from this model. Probably the fragment in Euseb. ix. 39, in which it is related how Jeremiah foretold the captivity, and how his prediction was fulfilled by the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, also belongs to Eupolemus. The fragment is according to the reading of the best manuscripts anonymous, but may on internal grounds be ascribed to Eupolemus (Freudenthal, p. 208 sq.). A chronological fragment in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 2114. 1, which computes in a summary manner the time from Adam and Moses respectively to the fifth year of Demetrius, or the twelfth of Ptolemy, gives us information concerning the *date of Eupolemus*. For by this Demetrius we must probably understand (see below) Demetrius I. Soter (162-150 B.C.), and hence Eupolemus would have written in the year 158-157 B.C. or shortly afterwards. He may therefore be, as many have supposed, identical with the Eupolemus mentioned 1 Macc. viii. 17. In this case he would be a Palestinian, which is certainly favoured also by the circumstance, that he seems, besides the translation of the LXX., of which the Book of Chronicles was certainly in his hands, to have made use also of the original Hebrew text (Freudenthal, pp. 108, 119). Concerning his nationality, whether Jew or heathen, opinions are, as also in the case of Demetrius, divided; Josephus, *c. Apion.* i. 23 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 42), esteemed him a heathen, as do also Hody and Kuhlmeier. On the other hand, Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* vi. 13. 7, and Jerome, *De viris illustr.* c. 38, regard him as a Jew. And this, as Freudenthal has recently shown, is undoubtedly correct (pp. 83-85).

Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 141: "Ἐτι δὲ καὶ Εὐπόλεμος ἐν τῇ ἡμοίᾳ πραγματείᾳ τὰ πάντα ἐτη φησὶν ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ ἄχρι τοῦ πέμπτου ἔτους Δημητρίου βασιλείας, Πτολεμαίου τὸ δωδέκατον βασιλεύοντος Αἰγύπτου, συνάγεσθαι ἐτη μρβ'. ἀφ' οὗ δὲ χρόνου ἐξήγαγε Μωυσῆς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐπὶ τὴν προειρημένην προθεσμίαν συνάγεσθαι ἐτη δισχίλια πεντακλίσια ὀγδοήκοντα. [ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ χρόνου τούτου ἄχρι τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ὑπάρχοντων Γαίου Δομετιανοῦ Κασσιανοῦ συναθροίζεται ἐτη ἑκατὸν εἰκοσι]. In this fragment also the text is defective. Above all, it is certain that the number 2580 must be corrected to 1580, since Eupolemus could not have reckoned 2580 years from Moses to his own time. Then the synchronism of the fifth year of Demetrius with the twelfth of Ptolemy causes difficulties. For no twelfth year of any Ptolemy coincides with the fifth year of Demetrius II. (= 142-141 B.C.). The twelfth year indeed of Ptolemy VII. (= 159-158) concurs with the fifth year of Demetrius I. (= 158-157 B.C.). But Ptolemy VII. Physcon was at that time only ruler of Cyrenaica. He reigned in Egypt contemporaneously with his brother Ptolemy VI. Philometor, who however began his reign four years previously. We must therefore either regard, with Gutschmid, the whole statement concerning Ptolemy as a gloss or, which is more simple, alter the number. However this may be, the supposition that Demetrius I. Soter is intended is especially favoured by the circumstance, that at all events such was the view of Clemens Alex. For he reckons from the fifth year of Demetrius to the consulship of Cn. Domitius Calvinus and C. Asinius Pollio (these names being certainly hidden under the corrupted words Γαίου Δομετιανοῦ Κασσιανῶ), i.e. to the year 40 B.C. in which Herod was named king (Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 14. 5) 120 years, which of necessity reach back to Demetrius I., even if the reckoning is not quite accurate. Gutschmid has best restored the closing words by the complement Γαίου Δομετρίου καὶ Ἀσινίου ὑπὸ Κασσιανῶ συναθροίζονται. Cassianus is mentioned as a chronologist by Clem. *Strom.* i. 21. 101.

Comp. in general: Huetius, *Demonstr. evang. Prop.* iv. c. ii. § 29. Hody, *De biblitor. textib.* p. 106. Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, pp. 18, 24. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung*, ii. 221 sq. Kuhlmeier, *Eupolemi fragmenta prolegomenis et commentario instructa*, Berol. 1840. Rauch, *De Alex. Polyh.* pp. 20-22. Cruice, *De Fl. Jos. fide*, pp. 58-61. C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. gr.* iii. 207 sqq. Vailant, *De historicis*, etc., pp. 52-59. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 481-483, 572-574. M. Niebuhr, *Gesch. Assur's*, pp. 353-356. Cobet in *Δόγμης ἑκδ. ὑπὸ Κόντου*, vol. i. (Leyden 1866) p. 168 sq. Ewald, *Gesch. d. V. Isr.* i. 76, vii. 91, 92. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* pp. 82 sqq., 105-130, 208 sqq., 225 sqq. Siegfried, *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875,

p. 476 sqq. Gutschmid, *Jahrb. f. prot. Theol.* 1875, p. 749 sqq. Grätz, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth.* 1877, p. 61 sqq. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Fl. Josephus* (1879), p. 58 sqq.

3. Artapanus.

In his work *περὶ Ἰουδαίων* Artapanus is still farther removed than Eupolemus from the sober and unadorned style of Demetrius. The sacred history is quite methodically embellished, or to speak more correctly remodelled, by fantastic and tasteless additions — and this recasting is throughout in the interest of the tendency to a glorification of the Jewish people. One chief aim is directed towards proving, that the Egyptians were indebted to the Jews for all useful knowledge and institutions. Thus the very first fragment (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 18) relates that Abraham, when he journeyed into Egypt, instructed the king, Pharethothes, in astrology. A second (Euseb. ix. 23) narrates how Joseph, when raised by the king to be the chief governor of the country, provided for the better cultivation of the land. And finally, the long article concerning Moses (Euseb. ix. 27) gives detailed information of his being the real founder of all the culture and even of the worship of the gods in Egypt. For he it was whom the Greeks call Musaeus, the instructor of Orpheus, the author of a multitude of useful inventions and attainments, of navigation, architecture, military science, and philosophy. He also divided the country into thirty-six provinces, and commanded each province to worship God; he also instructed the priests in hieroglyphics. He introduced order into State affairs. Hence he was beloved by the Egyptians, who called him Hermas, *διὰ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων ἐρμηνείαν*. King Chenephres however sought, out of envy, to get rid of him. But none of the means he used succeeded. When Chenephres was dead, Moses received commandment from God to deliver His people from Egyptian bondage. The history of the exodus and of all that preceded

it, especially of the miracles by which the permission to depart was extorted, is then related at length and in accordance with the Scripture narrative, but at the same time with many additions and embellishments. Single traits from this history are related, with express appeal to Artapanus, in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 154, in *Chron. pasch.* ed. Dindorf, i. 117, and in the *Chron. anonym.* in Cramer, *Anecdota*, Paris, ii. 176. Traces of the employment of this work may be pointed out especially in Josephus (see Freudenthal, pp. 169–171). The more plainly its Jewish authorship is manifested by the tendency of the whole work, the more strange does it appear, that Moses and the patriarchs should be exhibited as founders of the Egyptian worships. Jacob and his sons are represented as founding the sanctuaries at Athos and Heliopolis (23. 4). Moses directs each province to honour God (τὸν Θεὸν σεφθήσεται); he prescribes the consecration of the Ibis (27. 9) and of Apis (27. 12). In a word, the religion of Egypt is referred to Jewish authority. This fact has been explained by Freudenthal by the surely incorrect notion, that the author was indeed a Jew, but wanted to pass for a heathen, and indeed for an Egyptian priest (pp. 149 sq., 152 sq.). For nowhere does such an attempt come plainly forward. And with such a tendency, an entirely unknown name such as Artapanus would certainly never have been chosen as a shield. Nor does it at all explain the phenomena. For if the work had appeared under a heathen mask, we should surely expect, that it would have energetically denounced in the name of this acknowledged authority the abomination of idol-worship, as is actually done, e.g. in the case of the Sibyllist (iii. 20), and of pseudo-Aristeas (pp. 38, 14 sq., ed. Mor. Schmidt). Thus, under all circumstances, the strange fact remains, that a Jewish author has represented Moses as the founder of Egyptian rites. But however strange this may appear, it is explained by the tendency of the whole. Moses was the introducer of all culture, even of religious culture. This and nothing else is the meaning. Besides, it

must be considered, that the heathen worship is in reality represented in a tolerably innocent light. For the sacred animals are not so much worshipped, as on the contrary "consecrated" for their utility— $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\Theta\epsilon\hat{\omega}$, as we cannot but conclude. But even thus, we certainly have still to do with a Jewish author, who cared more for the honour of the Jewish name, than for the purity of divine worship. Perhaps too an apologetic purpose co-operated in causing the Jews, who were decried as despisers of the gods, to figure as founders of religious worship. Considering the marked prominence of Egyptian references, there needs no other proof that the author was an Egyptian. With regard to date, it can only be affirmed with certainty of him and of those who follow, that they were predecessors of Alexander Polyhistor.

Comp. in general: Huetius, *Demonstr. evang.* Prop. iv. c. ii. § 62. Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, p. 26. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung*, ii. 200–203. Rauch, *De Alexandro Polyhistore*, p. 22 sq. C. Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 207 sqq. Vaillant, *De historicis*, etc., pp. 74–83. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 483–486, 574. Cobet in the *Λόγος Ἐμῆς*, i. 170, 171. Ewald, ii. 129. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* pp. 143–174, 215 sqq., 231 sqq. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Josephus*, p. 60 sqq.

4. *Aristeas.*

A fragment from the work of one otherwise unknown, Aristeas *περὶ Ἰουδαίων*, in which the history of Job is briefly related in accordance with the Bible, is given in Euseb. *Praep. ev.* ix. 25. The history itself presents nothing worthy of remark, but the personal accounts both of Job and his friends are supplemented on the ground of other scriptural material. Thus it is said of Job, that he was formerly called *Jobab*, *Ἰώβ* being evidently identical with *Ἰωβάβ*, Gen. xxxvi. 33. Upon the ground of this identification Job is then made a descendant of Esau, for Jobab was a son of Serach (Gen. xxxvi. 33), and the latter a grandson of Esau (Gen. xxxvi. 10, 13). According indeed to the extract of

Alexander Polyhistor, Aristeas is said to have related that Esau himself "married Bassara and begot Job of her" (τὸν Ἡσὺν γήμαντα Βασσάρην ἐν Ἐδῶμ γεννῆσαι Ἰώβ). Most probably however this rests upon an inaccurate reference of Alexander Polyhistor; for Aristeas, who was quoting from the Bible, must certainly have called Jobab not the son, but correctly the great-grandson of Esau. From Gen. xxxvi. 33 is also derived the name Bassara as the mother of Job (Ἰωβὰς υἱὸς Ζαρὰ ἐκ Βοσόρρας, where indeed Bosra is in reality not the mother, but the native place of Jobab). Our author already used the LXX. translation of the Book of Job. It is moreover remarkable, that in the supplement to Job in the Septuagint the personal accounts of Job are compiled exactly after the manner of Aristeas. Freudenthal thinks it certain that this supplement was derived from Aristeas.

Comp. in general: C. Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 207 sqq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 488 sqq., 577-579. Ewald, vii. 92. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyhistor*, pp. 136-143, 231.

5. Cleodemus or Malchus.

The work of a certain Cleodemus or Malchus, of which unfortunately only a short notice is preserved, seems to have presented a classic example of that intermixture of native (Oriental) and Greek traditions, which was popular throughout the region of Hellenism. The notice in question is communicated by Alexander Polyhistor, but is taken by Eusebius, *Præp. evang.* ix. 20, not directly from the latter, but from Josephus, *Antt.* i. 15, who on his part quotes literally from Alexander. The author is here called Κλεόδημος ὁ προφήτης ὁ καὶ Μάλχος, ὁ ἱστορῶν τὰ περὶ Ἰουδαίων καθὼς καὶ Μωϋσῆς ἱστορήσεν ὁ νομοθέτης αὐτῶν. Both the Semitic name Malchus and the contents of the work prove, that the author was no Greek, but either a Jew or a Samaritan. Freudenthal prefers the latter view chiefly on account of the intermixture of Greek and Jewish traditions. But about 200-100 B.C. this is

quite as possible in a Jew as in a Samaritan. In the work of this Malchus it is related, that Abraham had three sons by Keturah, 'Αφέραν, Ἀσουρείμ, Ἰάφραν, from whom the Assyrians, the town of Aphra and the land of Africa derive their names. The orthography of the names (which I have given according to Freudenthal) vacillates considerably. Hence אֲשֻׁרִים, אֶפְרָה and עֶפְרָא, Gen. xxv. 3, 4, are evidently identical with them. But while in Gen. xxv. Arab tribes are intended, our author derives from them entirely different nations, which were known to him. He then further relates, that the three sons of Abraham departed with Heracles to Libya and Antaeus, that Heracles married the daughter of Aphra, and of her begat Diodorus, whose son again was Sophonas (or Sophax), from whom the Sophaki derive their name. These last traditions are also found in the Libyan (or Roman?) history of King Juba (Plutarch. Sertor. c. ix., also in Müller, *Fragm. hist. gr.* iii. 471); only that the genealogical relation of Diodorus and Sophax is reversed: Heracles begets Sophax of Tinge, the widow of Antaeus, and Diodorus is the son of Sophax.

Comp. in general: C. Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 207 sqq. Vaillant, *De historicis*, etc., pp. 72-74. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 489, 575. Ewald, vii. 91. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* pp. 130-136, 215, 230. Siegfried, *Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* 1875, p. 476 sq.

6. *An anonymous Writer.*

Among the extracts of Alexander Polyhistor are found, Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 17 and 18, two, which to judge by their contents are evidently identical, although the one is much shorter than the other. The longer (Euseb. ix. 17) is given as an extract from Eupolemus, who relates that Abraham descended in the [thir]teenth generation from the race of giants, who after the deluge built the tower of Babel, that he himself emigrated from Chaldaea to Phoenicia and taught the Phoenicians τροπὰς ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα.

He also proved of assistance to them in war. He then departed by reason of a famine to Egypt, where he lived with the priests in Heliopolis and taught them much, instructing them in τὴν ἀστρολογίαν καὶ τὰ λοιπά. The real discoverer however of astrology was Enoch, who received it from the angels and imparted it to men. We are told the same virtually, but more briefly, in the second extract, Euseb. ix. 18, which Alexander Polyhistor derived from *an anonymous work* (ἐν δὲ ἀδεσπότοις εὐρομεν). If this parallel narrative is itself striking, it must also be added, that the longer extract can scarcely be from Eupolemus. Eupolemus was a Jew, but in the extract Gerizim is explained by ὁρος ἰσχυρίστου. Also according to Eupolemus Moses was the first sage (Euseb. ix. 26), while in the extract Abraham is already glorified as the father of all science. Hence the supposition of Freudenthal, that the original of both extracts was one and the same, viz. *the anonymous work of a Samaritan*, and that the longer extract of Alexander has been ascribed by an oversight to Eupolemus, is one which commends itself. In this work also, as remains to be mentioned, Greek traditions and Scripture history are again blended.

Comp. in general : C. Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 207 sqq. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* pp. 82-103, 207 sq., 223 sqq. Siegfried, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875, p. 476.

7. Jason of Cyrene and the second Book of Maccabees.

The authors from whom extracts were made by Alexander Polyhistor compiled chiefly from the older Scripture history. The work of Jason of Cyrene, on which our second Book of Maccabees is based, is an example of the treatment of those important epochs of later Jewish history, in which they had themselves lived, by Hellenistic Jews. For this book is, as the author himself informs us, only an abridgment (ἐπιτομή, 2 Macc. ii. 26, 28) from the larger work of a certain Jason of Cyrene (2 Macc. ii. 23). The original work comprised five

volumes, which are in our second Book of Maccabees condensed into one (2 Macc. ii. 23). Thus the contents of the former seem to have been parallel with those of the latter. The abridgment handed down to us tells first of an unsuccessful attack upon the treasury of the temple, undertaken in the time of Seleucus IV. (B.C. 175) by his minister Heliodorus; it then relates the religious persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and the apostasy of a portion of the Jews; and lastly recounts the Maccabaeen rising and its progress down to the decisive victory of Judas over Nicanor (160 B.C.). Thus the book comprises a period of not much more than fifteen years, 175-160 B.C. The events related are for the most part the same as in the first Book of the Maccabees. But the narrative differs in many particulars, and in some parts even in the order of the events, from the account in the first book. The differences are of such a kind that an acquaintance with that book can hardly be assumed on the part of our author (Hitzig, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 415, holds the opposite view). At the same time there can be no doubt, that on the whole, the simple narrative of 1 Macc., based as it is on good native sources, deserves the preference over the rhetorical narrative of the second. On the other hand the latter offers a copiousness of independent detail, especially in the preliminary history of the Maccabaeen rising, the historical truth of which there are no grounds for doubting. The view must therefore be accepted, that contemporary sources of information were at the disposal also of Jason of Cyrene, but that these were probably not in writing, but only the oral accounts of contemporaries, who narrated from memory the events of those fifteen years. If such narratives reached Jason not directly, but through a series of intermediaries, this would explain both the copiousness and the inaccuracy of the details.

If the view that Jason of Cyrene derived the history he relates from the lips of contemporaries is correct, he must have written not long after 160 B.C. At all events, unless we are willing to allow for the use of written documents also, we must

not make the interval between the events and the date of the author too long, as otherwise an acquaintance with such numerous and yet relatively correct particulars would be no longer possible. Nor does the mythical character of many of the narratives (*e.g.* the martyrdom of Eleazar and the seven brethren, 2 Macc. vi.—vii.) tend against the view of so early an origin. For a period of a few decades—especially at a distance from the scene of the events—is more than sufficient for the formation of such myths. The unhistorical notice, xv. 37, that after the victory over Nicanor, Jerusalem remained in the hands of the Hebrews, can indeed only have been written by one at a great distance from the events. But on the other hand this scarcely affects Jason but his epitomizer. Why the narrative breaks off at the victory over Nicanor is somewhat enigmatical. Perhaps this ending was not contemplated by Jason.

With respect to the date of the epitomizer it can only be said, that he is certainly *more ancient than Philo*, who seems to have been acquainted with this book. Both the original work and the epitome were without doubt *originally written in Greek*. For it is very characteristically distinguished by its rhetorical Greek style from the annalistic Hebrew style of the first Book of Maccabees. The second book is very unlike the first in another respect also; it aims directly at edification by the narrative of the heroic faith of the Maccabees, and of the marvellous events by which God preserved the continuance of the Jewish religion and worship.

The two letters, which are now placed before this book (2 Macc. i.—ii. 18), stand in no connection with it. They are letters of the Palestinian to the Egyptian Jews, in which the latter are summoned to the feast of the Dedication. They are evidently two originally independent pieces of writing, afterwards combined by a later hand, but not that of the epitomizer, with this second Book of Maccabees. Their purpose is to influence the Egyptian Jews with respect to the feast of the Dedication.

In Philo's work, *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 13 (Mang. ii. 459), is described the manner in which many tyrants have persecuted the pious and virtuous. The several features of this description so greatly recall that of Antiochus Epiphanes in the second Book of Maccabees, that an acquaintance with this book on the part of Philo can scarcely be doubted; comp. Lucius, *Der Essenismus* (1881), pp. 36-39. Josephus has indeed a few points in common with this book, which are absent from 1 Macc. (see Grimm, *Exeget. Handb. zu 2 Macc.* p. 13). It is nevertheless very improbable that he was acquainted with the second Book of Maccabees (see Grimm, p. 20). On the other hand the philosophical exhortation, known as the fourth Book of Maccabees, is entirely based upon it.

Christian testimony begins with Heb. xi. 35; for *ἐτυμπατισθήσαν* evidently refers to 2 Macc. vi. 19, 28 (*ἐπὶ τὸ εὐμπατοῦν προσήγε, ἐπὶ τὸ εὐμπατοῦν εὐθίως ἦλθε*), while other allusions in Heb. xi. 35 sq. recall 2 Macc. vi.-vii. Comp. Bleek, *Stud. und Kritik*, 1853, p. 339, and Bleek's *Commentary* on Heb. xi. 35. The oldest quotation is Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 97: 'Ἀριστοβοῦλῳ . . . οὗ μέμνηται ὁ συνταξάμενος τὴν τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν ἐπιτομὴν (comp. 2 Macc. i. 10). Hippolytus in his work, *de Christo et Anti-christo*, c. 49 (Lagarde, p. 25), refers to this book in the words: καὶ ταῦτα μὲν . . . σέσημανται ἐν τοῖς Μακκαβαϊκοῖς.

Origen appeals in many passages to this book in proof of important doctrines: 1. Of the doctrine of creation *ex nihilo* to 2 Macc. vii. 28 (*ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ Θεός*): *Comment. in Joann.* vol. i. c. 18 (Lommatzsch, i. 37); *de principiis*, ii. 1. 5 (Lommatzsch, xxi. 142). 2. Of the doctrine of the intercession of saints to 2 Macc. xv. 14 (*ὁ πολλὰ προσευχόμενος περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀγίας πόλεως Ἰερουσάλης*): *Comment. in Joann.* vol. xiii. c. 57 (Lommatzsch, ii. 120); *in Cant. Cant.* lib. iii. (Lommatzsch, xv. 26); *de oratione*, c. 11 (Lommatzsch, xvii. 125). 3. He also makes special and very full mention of the history of Eleazar and the seven Maccabaeian brothers (2 Macc. vi. 18-vii. *fin.*) as glorious examples of dauntless martyrdom in the *Exhortatio ad martyrium*, c. 22-27 (Lommatzsch, xx. 261-268); comp. also *Comment. in epist. ad Rom.* lib. iv. c. 10 (Lommatzsch, vi. 305). 4. Other quotations in Origen: *fragm. in Exod.* (Lommatzsch, viii. 302); *contra Cels.* viii. 46, *fin.* (Lommatzsch, xx. 176).

Cyprian also quotes the history of the Maccabaeian martyrs, 2 Macc. vi.-vii. (*ad Fortunatum*, c. 11, and *Testim.* iii. 17). The Fathers in general have delighted in treating of these Maccabaeian martyrs (often with the use of the so-called fourth Book of Maccabees); nay, they were at last transplanted among Christian saints. For material bearing on this, see Wetstein's

notes on Origen, *Exhort. ad martyr.* c. 23 (Lommatzsch, xx. 262), and the *Vitae Sanctorum* (Lipomannus, Surius, Bollandist., Nilles' *Kalendarium manuale*, 1879 to August 1); some also in Freudenthal, *Die Flavii Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft* (1869), p. 29 sqq. Creuzer, *Stud. und Krit.* 1853, p. 85 sq. Bähr, *Die christlichen Dichter und Geschichtschreiber Roms* (2nd ed. 1872); p. 50 sqq.

Its title as the second Book of the Maccabees is first found in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 9, *fin.*: 'Ἀριστοβούλος . . . οὗτος δ' αὐτός ἐκεῖνος, οὗ καὶ ἡ δευτέρα τῶν Μακκαβαίων ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς βίβλου μνημονεύει. Hieronymus, *Prol. galeatus* to the Books of Samuel (Vallarsi, ix. 459): *Machabaeorum primum librum Hebraicum reperi. Secundus Graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque φράσει probari potest.*

With respect to *manuscripts, editions and ancient translations*, what was said above, p. 10, in the case of the first Book of Maccabees, applies in most instances to the second. We need only remark: (1) that the second Book of Maccabees is not contained in the cod. Sinaiticus, and (2) that besides the old Latin translation, which has passed into the Vulgate (and which alone Sabatier, *Biblior. sacrar. Lat. versiones antiquae*, vol. ii., knows), there is another in a cod. Ambrosianus from which Peyron has published it (*Ciceronis orationum pro Scauro, pro Tullio et in Clodium fragmenta inedita*, 1824, p. 73 sqq.); the edition of the same text promised for Ceriani's *Monumenta sacra et prof.* vol. i. fasc. 3, has, as far as I know, not yet made its appearance.

The *exegetical and critical literature* also of this book is almost entirely the same as that of the first Book of Maccabees (see above, p. 11 sq.). In the *Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen* (Leipzig 1857) the fourth part compiled by Grimm treats of the second, third and fourth Books of the Maccabees. We mention besides: [H. Eberh. (Hlo. Paulus), "Ueber das zweyte Buch der Maccabäer" (Eichhorn's *Allg. Biblioth. der bibl. Literatur*, vol. i. 1787, pp. 233–241). Bertheau, *De secundo libro Maccabaeorum*, Gotting. 1829. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 443–456. Patrizzi, *De consensu utriusque libri Machabaeorum*, Romae 1856. Cigoi, *Historischchronologische Schwierigkeiten im zweiten Makkabäerbuche*, Klagenfurt 1868. Kasten, *Der historische Werth des zweiten Buches der Makkabäer*, Stolp 1879 (Gymnasialprogr.).

On the two letters at the beginning of the book see (besides the above-named literature): Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, pp. 38–44. Schlünkes, *Epistolae quae secundo Macc. libro i. 1–9, legitur explicatio*, Colon. 1844. The same, *Difficiliorum locorum epistolae quae 2 Macc. i. 10–ii. 18, legitur explicatio*, Colon. 1847. Grätz, "Das Sendschreiben der Palästinenser an die ägyptisch-

judäischen Gemeinden wegen der Feier der Tempelweihe" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1877, pp. 1-16, 49-60).

8. *The Third Book of Maccabees.*

The so-called third Book of Maccabees may here be mentioned along with the second, as having at least the form of an historical narrative of a supposed episode of later Jewish history. In truth it is a tolerably insipid piece of fiction founded at most on an entirely unascertainable historical fact. It relates how Ptolemy IV. Philopator, after his victory over Antiochus the Great at Raphia, came to Jerusalem and entertained the desire of entering also the interior of the temple. As he was not to be turned from his purpose by any representations, the Jews in their distress cried to God, who heard their prayer and struck Ptolemy, so that he fell stunned to the ground (i.-ii. 24). Ptolemy exasperated returned to Egypt and meditated revenge. He deprived the Alexandrian Jews of their civic rights, and commanded that all the Jews in Egypt, together with their wives and children, should be brought in chains to Alexandria, where they were confined in the racecourse. Their number was so great, that the clerks, who were to write down the names of each, had not, after forty days' labour, come to the end, and were obliged to leave off for want of writing materials (ii. 25-iv. *fin.*). Ptolemy now commanded that five hundred elephants should be intoxicated by wine and incense and incited against the people in the racecourse. When all preparations had been made the execution was delayed till the next day, because the king had slept till the time for his chief meal. On the second day too nothing was done, because the king had, through the dispensation of God, suddenly forgotten everything, and was very angry to find that hostile designs were entertained against his faithful servants the Jews. On the same day however he repeated at his repast the former

order for the extirpation of the Jews. When then on the third day matters at last seemed getting serious, and the king was already approaching the racecourse with his troops, two angels appeared from heaven at the prayer of the Jews and paralysed the troops of the king with terror. The elephants then rushed upon the troops of the king, trampled on and destroyed them (v.-vi. 21). The king was now much irritated against his counsellors and commanded the Jews to be liberated from their chains, nay, to be entertained for seven days at his expense. Then they celebrated their deliverance with feasting and rejoicing, and resolved to keep these days as festivals for ever. And the king issued a letter of protection in favour of the Jews to all governors in the provinces, and gave the Jews permission to put to death such of their fellow-countrymen as had apostatized from the faith. They made abundant use of this permission and returned joyfully home (vi. 22-vii. *fin.*).

This narrative is not only almost throughout a mere fiction, but it belongs, among productions of the kind, to those of the weakest sort. The author evidently revels in keeping up psychological impossibilities. The style also corresponds, being bombastic and involved. The only foundation for the author's fiction seems to have been an old legend which we still read in Josephus. For he relates (*contra Apion.* ii. 5) that Ptolemy VII. Physcon cast the Jews of Alexandria, who as adherents of Cleopatra were his political opponents, to intoxicated elephants, who however turned instead against the friends of the king, whereupon the king gave up his purpose and the Jews of Alexandria celebrated the day in remembrance of the event. According to this account the celebration of this festival, which is also mentioned in the third Book of Maccabees (vi. 36), seems at all events to be historical. And some unascertained fact may certainly be the foundation of the legend, the older form of which seems to have been in the hands of Josephus, since all is in his account simpler and more psychologically

comprehensible, and he was evidently unacquainted with the third Book of Maccabees. When then the latter refers the history to Ptolemy IV. instead of VII., this is already a divergence from the older legend, and still more so are the other additions with which the author has enriched his narrative.

As to the *date of the author*, the utmost that can be ventured is a conjecture. The contents and tendency of the book seem to presuppose a persecution of the Alexandrian Jews, on account of which the author desires to comfort and encourage his co-religionists. This leads our thoughts to *the time of Caligula*, when such a persecution on a large scale took place for the first time. Hence Ewald, Hausrath, Reuss and others place the composition of the book in his reign. But then it would be strange, that the author does not make Ptolemy lay claim to divine honours, which was the chief stumbling-block in the case of Caligula. On the whole we should expect in it more special references to events under Caligula. Hence we can but approve of Grimm's reservation, though he has every inclination to agree with Ewald's hypothesis (*Exeget. Handb.* p. 218 sq.). In general, we may say, that the book originated at the earliest in the first century before Christ, at the latest in the first century after Christ; the former, because the author already knows the Greek additions to Daniel (vi. 6); the latter, because it would otherwise have found no acceptance with the Christian Church.

The oldest Christian testimony is the *Canones apost.* (in Cotelier, *Patr. apost.* 2nd ed. i. 453) canon 76 (*al.* 85): Μακκαβαίων τρία. The stichometry of Nicephorus also reckons: Μακκαβαϊκά γ' (in Credner, *Zur Gesch. des Kanons*, p. 119). In the *Synopsis Athanasii* stands instead Μακκαβαϊκά βιβλία δ', Πτολεμαϊκά (Credner, p. 144), where, according to Credner's conjecture, καί is perhaps to be read instead of the number δ', so that our third Book of Maccabees would have to be understood by Πτολεμαϊκά. For other testimony, see Eichhorn, *Einl. in die apokr. Schriften des A. T.* p. 288 sq. Grimm, *Handb.* p. 221 sq. *The book seems never to have been known in*

the *Latin Church*, on which account it is absent from the Vulgate. On the other hand, it found approbation in the *Syrian Church*, as the existing old Syriac translation proves. The name "Book of Maccabees" has been very inaptly given to the book, merely because here also a persecution of Jews faithful to their religion is the subject.

The book is as a rule found in the *manuscripts* of the Septuagint, so especially in the cod. Alexandrinus. Hence it is also found in most *editions* of the Septuagint and in the separate editions of the Greek apocryphal books (see above, p. 10 sq.). Of ancient versions the old Syriac need only be mentioned here (see above, p. 11).

For the exegetical aids in general, see above, p. 11. Commentary: Grimm, "Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer" (*Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des A.T.'s*, Part 4), Leipzig 1857. Investigations: Eichhorn, *Einkl. in die apokryphischen Schriften des A.T.'s*, pp. 278-290. Bertholdt, *Einkl. in sämtliche kanon. und apokr. Schriften des A. u. N. T.* vol. iii. pp. 1082-1091. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 611-614. De Wette-Schrader, *Einkl. in das A.T.'s*, p. 572 sq. Keil, *Einkl. in das A.T.* 3rd ed. p. 720 sq. Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. ii. 262-265. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments*, § 574.

9. Philo's Historical Works.

Philo, the philosopher, must also be named here as a writer of works on Jewish history. Indeed he has left us narratives not only from the *more ancient* history, but also from that of *his own times*.

1. With respect to the former a large work, which has been preserved almost entire, viz. a comprehensive *delineation of the Mosaic legislation*, must first be mentioned. It is not indeed an historical narrative properly so called, but a systematic statement; still it is one so made, that Philo attempts therein to give a survey of the legislative labours of Moses himself, i.e. of the virtual contents of the Pentateuch. That he does not do this without being essentially influenced by his own philosophical views is a thing self-evident. But still his purpose is simply to give, in an objective historical manner, a survey of the Mosaic legislation. The several

parts of this work have come down to us in the manuscripts and editions under special titles, as though they were separate books. It will be shown below, § 34, that the plan of the whole work is as follows: (a) The first book refers to the *creation of the world*. For Moses treated of this in the beginning of his work, to make it plain that his legislation was according to the will of nature. (b) The following books treat of the lives of Enos, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph, but so that the first three are only briefly treated in the introduction to the life of Abraham, while the last four have each a separate book devoted to them. The lives of Abraham and Joseph have been preserved. The histories of all these individuals is related, because by their lives they exhibit the universal types of morality, "the living unwritten law." (c) Next follows *the legislation proper, the ten chief commandments*, first in one book and then in four books, *the special laws* arranged according to the rubrics of the ten commandments (particulars, § 34). Thus a survey is really taken of the actual contents of the Pentateuch. The tendency of the entire work is everywhere to hold up the Jewish law as the wisest and most humane. The ritual and ceremonial laws are not passed by; but Philo always knows how to realize their rational side, so that he who perfectly observes them is not only the best, but also the most cultured man, the true philosopher. This also makes it clear that the work, if not solely, was chiefly intended for *non-Jewish readers*. The educated of all nations were to be brought by it to the perception, that the Jewish was the most perfect law, the law by which men were best trained to be good citizens and true philosophers.

In a separate work, which does not, as has been usually supposed, belong to this collective work, Philo has also written *a life of Moses* himself. In this also the manner and object are the same as in the systematic work. Moses is described as the greatest and wisest of lawgivers, and as raised above all others by mighty deeds and miraculous experiences.

2. Philo also described in a lengthy work the most important and the saddest episode of the Jewish history of his times, *the persecutions of the Jews under Caligula*. By way of introduction he spoke also in it of the persecutions brought about by Sejanus in the reign of Tiberius. The work, according to Eusebius, contained five books. The two which have come down to us (*in Flaccum* and *de legatione ad Cajum*) probably formed the third and fourth (particulars, § 34). Philo having been an eye-witness of the events he narrates, nay, as leader of a Jewish embassy to Caligula, a prominent sharer in them, his work is a first-class authority for the history of this period.

10. *Josephus*.

The best known historian of Jewish affairs in the Greek language is the Palestinian Josephus, properly Joseph, the son of Matthias, a priest of Jerusalem. Of his two chief works one is, the *Ἰουδαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία*, a *comprehensive delineation of the entire Jewish history* from the beginning to his own times. It is the most extensive work on Jewish history in the Greek language with which we are acquainted, and has on that account so retained the lasting favour of Jewish, heathen and Christian readers, as to have been preserved entire in numerous manuscripts (particulars, see above, Div. i. vol. i. § 3). Notwithstanding its great difference from the philosophizing delineation of Philo, its tendency is similar. For it is the purpose of Josephus, not only to instruct his heathen readers, for whom it was in the first instance intended, in the history of his people, but also to inspire them with respect for the Jewish nation, both as having a history of hoar antiquity, and a long series of celebrities both in peace and war to point to, and as able to bear comparison in respect of laws and institutions with any nation (comp. especially *Antt.* xvi. 6. 8). The other chief work of Josephus, the *History of the Jewish War from A.D. 66–73*, gives the history more for its own sake. The events of these

years are in themselves so important, that they seemed worthy of a detailed description. Perhaps it was written by command of Vespasian, from whom Josephus received an annual salary (*Vita*, 76), and to whom the work was delivered as soon as it was completed (*contra Apion*. i. 9; *Vita*, 65). If a tendency to boasting is detected in it, this refers rather to the individual Josephus and the Romans than to the Jewish nation.

11. *Justus of Tiberias.*

Justus of Tiberias, a contemporary and fellow-countryman of Josephus, was also his fellow-labourer. He too devoted himself to authorship after the destruction of his nation, but having been less successful therein than Josephus, his works were less read, and have therefore been lost. He has this in common with Josephus, that he too treated both of Jewish history as a whole and of the events of his own times, each in one work. His *History of the Jewish Kings*, from Moses to Agrippa II., was, according to the statement of Photius, who was still acquainted with it (*Biblioth. Cod.* 33), "very brief in expression, and passed over much that was necessary." As it was made use of by Julius Africanus in his *Chronicle*, it may well be supposed that its form was that of a chronicle, in which stress was chiefly laid upon the settling of the chronology.

In another work Justus seems to have presented, whether wholly or partly, the *History of the Jewish War* in a manner by which Josephus felt himself compromised, since in his *Vita* he enters into a very warm controversy against Justus.

IV. EPIC POETRY AND THE DRAMA.

1. *Philo the Epic Poet.*

The appropriation of Greek forms of literature on the part of the Hellenistic Jews did not stop at prose. *Even the epic*



and dramatic poetry of the Greeks were transplanted to the soil of Hellenistic Judaism, the sacred history being sung under the form of the Greek Epos, nay, represented in the form of the Greek drama. For what is still preserved of this remarkable literature, we are indebted to the extracts of Alexander Polyhistor, which have been inserted by Eusebius in his *Praeparatio evangelica* (see above, p. 197 sqq.).

Three small fragments from a Greek poem "On Jerusalem" (*Περὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα*) by a certain Philo are given by Eusebius (*Euseb. Praep. evang.* ix. 20, 24, 37). The subject of the first is *Abraham*, of the second *Joseph*, of the third *the springs and water-pipes of Jerusalem*, the abundance of which is extolled. The first and third are taken from the first book of the work quoted (ix. 20: *Φίλων ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Περὶ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα*; ix. 37: *Φίλων ἐν τοῖς Περὶ Ἱεροσολύμων . . . ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ*); the second professedly from the fourteenth (ix. 24: *Φίλων ἐν τῇ ιδ' τῶν Περὶ Ἱεροσόλυμα*). But that Philo should have used fourteen books to get as far as the history of Joseph is too improbable. Hence we may suppose with Freudenthal, that possibly we must read *ἐν τῇ ιδ'* instead of *ἐν τῇ δ'*. The language of Philo is that of the Greek epic, but his hexameters are written with a true contempt of Greek prosody, and the diction is pompous, and so involved as to be unintelligible.

The Philo mentioned by Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 141, and by Josephus, *contra Apion.* i. 23 (= *Euseb. Praep. evang.* ix. 42), and whom Josephus distinguishes from the more recent philosopher by calling him Philo the elder (*Φίλων ὁ πρεσβύτερος*), is certainly identical with our epic writer. According to the notice of him in Clemens Alexandrinus, we might indeed suppose, that some prose writer, who treated Jewish history in like manner as Demetrius and Eupolemus ~~δο~~, was spoken of (*Strom.* i. 21. 141: *Φίλων δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέγραψε τοὺς βασιλεῖς τοὺς Ἰουδαίων διαφώνως τῷ Δημητρίῳ*). Josephus took him for a heathen, for he adduces him, together with Demetrius and Eupolemus, as a proof, that many

heathen authors also had a tolerably accurate acquaintance with Jewish history. But the circumstance that both Clemens and Josephus, in the passages cited, place this Philo *in the same series* as Demetrius and Eupolemus (both have the order Demetrius, Philo, Eupolemus), proves, that both were drawing from the same source, and this can be no other than Alexander Polyhistor. Since then no other Philo than the epic writer occurs in the copious contributions from Alexander Polyhistor in Eusebius, there is no doubt that Clemens and Josephus mean the same. Consequently Philo, as the fragments in Eusebius give us reason to suppose, sang in such wise of the town of Jerusalem as to give at the same time a history of the Jewish kings.

As to the date of Philo this much only can be said, that he preceded Alexander Polyhistor. Hence he may be perhaps placed in the second century before Christ. There is no direct evidence that he was a Jew, but from the tenor of his poem it can scarcely be doubtful.

Comp. in general: Huetius, *Demonstr. ev. Prop.* iv. c. 2, § 33. Viger's *Anm. zu Euseb.* ix. 20. Philippson, *Ezechiel des jüdischen Trauerspieldichters Auszug aus Egypten und Philo des Aelteren Jerusalem*, 1830. Delitzsch, *Zur Gesch. der jüd. Poesie* (1836), pp. 24, 209. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religions-Philosophie*, ii. 215, note. Cruice, *De Fl. Josephi fide* (1844), p. 61 sq. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 207 sqq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 519, 575. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 338, vii. 91. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyhistor*, pp. 34, 100, 170.

2. Theodotus.

The poem of Theodotus on Sichem, a long portion from which is given partly by verbal quotation, partly by a statement of its contents, in Euseb. *Præp. evang.* ix. 22, seems to have been of the same kind as that of Philo on Jerusalem. The entire portion refers to the *history of the town of Sichem*. Its situation is first described, and then its seizure by the

Hebrews, in accordance with Gen. xxxiv. ; how Jacob first dwelt in Mesopotamia, there married and begat children, then departed with them to the district of Sichem, and received a portion of land from Emmor the king of Sichem ; next, how Sichem the son of Emmor ravished Dinah, Jacob's daughter, whereupon Jacob declared himself ready to give Dinah to Sichem to wife, on condition that all the Sichemites should be circumcised ; and lastly, how Simeon and Levi, two of Jacob's sons, slew Emmor and Sichem and, in conjunction with their brethren, destroyed the city of the Sichemites. Jacob's sojourn in Mesopotamia not being mentioned till after the description of the town of Sichem, and only as an introduction to the history of its seizure by the Hebrews which follows, it is evident that the history of the town of Sichem is the real theme of the poem ; and since it is called a " holy city" (*Ἱερὸν ἄστυ*), it can scarcely be doubted that Theodotus was a Samaritan. Hence the title *Περὶ Ἰουδαίων* given to the poem in Eusebius can hardly be accurate. At the commencement of the extract it is said, that the town had its name from Sikimios, a son of Hermes (*ἀπὸ Σικιμίου τοῦ Ἑρμοῦ*). Theodotus thus seems like other Hellenists to have embellished Jewish history with scraps from Greek mythology. The diction, as well as the construction of the hexameters, is better than Philo's. With respect to date, what was said of Philo applies here also.

Comp. in general : Huetius, *Demonstr. ev.* iv. 2. 32. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* x. 516. Müller, *Fragm. hist. gr.* iii. 207 sqq. Pauly's *Real-Enc. der class. Alterthumswissensch.*, art. "Theodotus," Nr. 13. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 520 sq., 576 sq. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 338, vii. 91. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* p. 99 sq.

3. *Ezekiel the Tragic Poet.*

The most remarkable phenomenon in the department of Judæo-Hellenistic poetry is the manufacture of scriptural matter into Greek dramas. We know indeed of only one

such Jewish dramatist, Ezekiel; and it must be left uncertain whether he had either successor or predecessor. But at all events he composed other dramas besides the one which is known to us by extracts, being called "The poet of Jewish tragedies" (Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 155: ὁ Ἐζεκιήλος ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν τραγυδιῶν ποιητής. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 28: Ἐζεκιήλος ὁ τῶν τραγυδιῶν ποιητής). We know more by extensive extracts in Eusebius and Clemens Alexandrinus (after Alexander Polyhistor) of one of them, which was called "*the Exodus*," Ἐξαγωγή, and which depicted the history of the departure of the Jews from Egypt (Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 155: ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ δράματι "Ἐξαγωγή." Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 29. 14, ed. Gaisford: ἐν τῷ δράματι τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Ἐξαγωγή). The moment chosen as the starting-point of the action was apparently that when Moses fled to Midian after slaying the Egyptian (Ex. ii.); for the first extract transposes us to that period (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 28 = Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 23. 155-156). It is a long monologue of Moses, in which he relates the history of his life down to that juncture, and concludes with the words, that he is now in consequence a wanderer in a foreign land. He then sees the seven daughters of Raguel approaching (Ex. ii. 16 sqq.) and asks who they are, when Zipporah gives him the information. The further progress of the action is only alluded to in the extract, where we are told that the watering of the flock and the marriage of Zipporah with Moses now takes place (Ex. ii. 16 sqq.). In the second extract (Euseb. ix. 29. 4-6, ed. Gaisford) Moses relates a dream to his father-in-law, which the latter explains to mean, that Moses will attain to a high official post, and will have the knowledge of things past, present and future. In another scene (Euseb. ix. 29. 7-11, ed. Gaisford) it is represented, on the authority of Ex. iii.-iv., how God spoke to Moses from a burning bush and commissioned him to deliver the people of Israel from bondage. As God speaks invisibly from the bush, He is not made to appear on the stage, but only His voice is heard. The details

are pretty much in agreement with Ex. iii.-iv. In the extract which follows (Euseb. ix. 29. 12-13, ed. Gaisford) God gives (according to Ex. xi.-xii.) more exact directions concerning the departure and the celebration of the Passover. It cannot be decided, whether this also belongs to the scene of the bush. In a further scene (Euseb. ix. 29. 14, ed. Gaisford) an Egyptian enters, who has escaped the catastrophe in the Red Sea, and relates how the Israelites passed safely through the waters and the Egyptian host perished in them. Finally, in the last fragment (Euseb. ix. 29. 15-16) a messenger, in whom we are to imagine one sent to reconnoitre for the Israelites, announces to Moses the discovery of an excellent place of encampment at Elim, with twelve springs of water and seventy palm trees (Ex. xv. 27 = Num. xxxiii. 9). Then the messenger relates how a marvellously strong bird, nearly twice as large as an eagle, which all the other birds followed as their king, appeared. The description of this bird is also found, without mention of the name of Ezekiel, in Eustathius, *Comm. in Hexaemeron*, ed. Leo Allatius (1629), p. 25 sq.

From these fragments it appears, that the action agrees pretty closely with the scriptural narrative, though with many embellishments of detail. The poetry of the author is very prosaic. On the other hand a certain amount of skill in dramatizing the material cannot be denied him. The diction and versification (Iambic trimeters) are tolerably fluent. It has been doubted—incorrectly it seems to me—whether this drama was ever intended for representation. The aim of it is certainly the same as that of the scriptural dramas of the Middle Ages (the passion plays, etc.), viz. on the one hand to make the people, in this way also, better acquainted with sacred history, on the other and chiefly, to supplant as far as possible profane and heathen pleasures by the supply of such "wholesome food." Here perhaps, as in other productions of Judæo-Hellenistic literature, heathen readers and spectators were calculated on.

That Ezekiel was a Jew is undoubtedly shown even by his

name. What was said of the dates of Philo and Theodotus applies in his case also.

Comp. in general: Huetius, *Demonstr. evang.* iv. 2. 24. Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, ii. 305 sq., viii. 624 sq., 635, 636. Eichhorn, "De Judaeorum re scenica," in the *Commentationes Societ. Gotting. recentiores*, vol. ii. Gotting. 1813. Philippson, *Ezechiel des jüdischen Trauerspieldichters Auszug aus Egypten und Philo des Aelteren Jerusalem*, 1830. Delitzsch, *Zur Gesch. der jüdischen Poesie* (1836), pp. 28, 209, 211-219. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religions-Philosophie*, ii. 199 sq. Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i. 264. Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (1851), pp. 113-119. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 517-519. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 127, iv. 338. Bähr in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iii. 365. Dübner in the appendix to *Fragmenta Euripidis, iterum*, ed. F. G. Wagner (*accedunt indices locupletissimi, Christus patiens, Ezechiel et christianorum poetarum reliquiae dramaticae*), Paris, Didot 1846, pp. 7-10 and 1-7. Magnin, *Journal des Savants*, 1848, pp. 193-208 (Recension of Dübner's appendix to *Fragn. Eurip.* ed. Wagner). Dindorf, *Praefat.* to his edition of Euseb. *Opp.* vol. i. pp. 19-25. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur*, ii. 2 (3rd ed. 1872), p. 76. Cobet in the *Δογμ. Ερμης*, i. 457-459.

V. PHILOSOPHY.

In the departments of history and poetry it was chiefly only the external form that was borrowed from the Greeks, but in that of philosophy a real internal blending of Jewish and Greek *thought*, a strong actual influencing of Jewish belief by the philosophy of the Greeks, took place. We perceive this the most plainly in Philo. He exhibits a completely double aspect; on one side he is a Jew, on the other a Greek philosopher (particulars, § 34). But we should be much mistaken if we took him for an isolated phenomenon in the history of his people and age. He is but a classic representative of a current flowing through centuries and necessarily implied by the nature of Hellenistic Judaism. To Greek *culture* belonged also an acquaintance with the great thinkers of the Greeks. The Hellenistic Jews, in appropriating the

former, thereby placed themselves also under the influence of Greek philosophy. We have certain proofs of this since the second century before Christ. But we may assume, that the fact mentioned is in general as old as Hellenistic Judaism itself. The Jew, whom Aristotle met in Asia Minor, was already 'Ελληνικὸς οὐ τῇ διαλέκτῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ (see vol. ii. 225).

The Jewish feature of this Judæo-Hellenistic philosophy appears chiefly in the fact, that like the Palestinian חכמים it pursued essentially *practical aims*. Not logic or physics, but ethic was in its sight the chief matter. This ethic was indeed often founded upon the theoretic philosophy of the Greeks. Still the latter is but a means to an end, the proper end of Jewish philosophers, viz. the practical one of educating man to true morality and piety.

Also in the choice made of the *literary form*, the Jewish foundation is still apparent. The case here is exactly the reverse of what it is in poetry. The contents exhibit a strong Greek influence, but the literary form is derived from Palestine. The author of the Wisdom of Solomon chooses the form of *proverbs*, Philo gives his discussions in the manner of Rabbinic *Midrash*, i.e. in prolix learned commentaries on the text of the Pentateuch, from which the most heterogeneous philosophic ideas are developed by the help of allegorical exegesis. The so-called fourth Book of the Maccabees is a hortatory address, of which the synagogue sermon may perhaps be regarded as the model. Only in a few smaller pieces does Philo choose the form of inquiry and dialogue after Greek models.

In the *mixture of Jewish and Greek notions* in these writers the proportions of course vary. In some the influence of Greek ideas is stronger, in others weaker. But even those which are most saturated with Greek ideas are essentially rooted in the soil of Judaism. For they not only insist upon the unity of a supramundane God and the control of Divine Providence, which punishes the wicked and rewards the good, but they also firmly adhere to the belief

that the most perfect knowledge of things human and divine is given in the Mosaic revelation, so that Judaism is the way to true wisdom and virtue. And not only does the amount of Greek influence vary, but different Greek systems are preferred, now one, now another being more agreed with. Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics and Pythagoreans have all furnished material to the sphere of ideas of these Jewish philosophers. Especially in the Platonico-Pythagorean and in the Stoic teaching did Jewish thinkers find many elements capable of being assimilated with the Jewish faith. That the appropriation of these was always eclectic is self-evident. But here Jewish philosophy only participates in the fundamental characteristic of later Greek philosophy in general.

1. *The Wisdom of Solomon.*

We place the so-called "Wisdom of Solomon" first, not because it is certainly the oldest of the literary productions to be here discussed, but because it most closely resembles in form the ancient Palestinian *proverbial wisdom*. In like manner as Jesus the son of Sirach does the author praise true wisdom, which is to be found only with God, and is imparted to man by God alone. But the execution is quite different from that of Jesus Sirach. While the latter shows, how the truly wise man comports himself in the different circumstances of practical life, this book is properly only a *warning against the folly of ungodliness*, and especially of idolatry. Around this one theme do the contents of the whole book revolve, and consequently the proverbial form is not strictly adhered to, but often passes into that of connected discourse.

According to chap. ix. 7 sqq., Solomon himself is to be regarded as the speaker, and those addressed are the judges and kings of the earth (i. 1: οἱ κρινοντες τὴν γῆν; vi. 1: βασιλεῖς, δικασταὶ περάτων γῆς). Thus it is properly an exhortation of Solomon to *his royal colleagues the heathen potentates*. He, the wisest of all kings, represents to them

the folly of ungodliness, and the excellence of true wisdom. Its contents may be divided into three groups. It is first shown (chaps. i.-v.) that the wicked and ungodly, although for a period apparently prosperous, will not escape the judgments of God, but that the pious and just, after having been for a time tried by sufferings, attain to true happiness and immortality. In a second section (chaps. vi.-ix.) Solomon directs his royal colleagues to his own example. It is just because he has loved high and divine wisdom, and has united himself to her as his bride, that he has attained to glory and honour. Hence he still prays for such wisdom. The third section (chaps. x.-xix.) points out, by referring to the history of Israel, and especially to the different lots of the Israelites and the Egyptians, the blessing of godliness and the curse of ungodliness. A very long tirade on the folly of idolatry (chaps. xiii.-xv.) is here inserted.

The work being in its chief contents a warning against the folly of ungodliness, it can only be so far intended for Jewish readers, as ungodliness was to be found among them also. But we should be hardly mistaken, if we were to suppose, that the author had heathen readers, at least as much in view. The numerous allusions to Scripture history seem indeed to presuppose Jewish readers (so *e.g.* Grimm, *Exeget. Handb.* p. 27). But then what is the purpose of the garment chosen, according to which the kings and potentates of the earth are addressed? Why the long-winded discourse on the folly of idolatry, for which there was no occasion with Jewish readers, who still deserved the name? The contents recall in many respects the Sibylline oracles, which, going forth under a heathen authority, were certainly intended for heathen readers. As in these so in the book in question the folly of an ungodly life is set before its readers. At all events its warning and instruction are addressed to heathen-minded readers, whether these are by birth Jews or heathen, and chiefly indeed to the great and mighty of this world.

The special theological *standpoint* of the author agrees with

that of Palestinian proverbial wisdom, as we find it in the Proverbs of Solomon and in Jesus the son of Sirach. *Divine Wisdom is the supreme good*, the source of all truth, virtue and happiness with our author also. But while, like the author of the Book of Proverbs and Jesus Sirach, he starts from the assertion, that this Wisdom is first of all present with God, it becomes in his conception almost an independent person beside God. His utterances indeed do not seem to really exceed what we already read in Prov. viii.-ix. But what is there more a poetic personification becomes with him a philosophic theory. Wisdom is according to him a breath (*ἀτμός*) of God's power, a pure effluence (*ἀπόρροια*) from the glory of the Almighty, the brightness (*ἀπαύγασμα*) of the everlasting light (vii. 25, 26). It is most intrinsically united with God (*συμβίωσιν θεοῦ ἔχουσα*), is initiated into the knowledge of God (*μύστις τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπιστήμης*), and a chooser of His works (*αἰρέτις τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ*), i.e. chooses among the works, of which God has conceived the idea, which shall be carried into execution (viii. 3, 4: comp. Grimm on the passage), is assessor on God's throne (ix. 4: *ἡ τῶν σὼν θρόνων πάρεδρος*), understands the works of God, and was present when He created the world, knows what is well-pleasing in His eyes and right according to His commandments (ix. 9). Wisdom is thus not only represented as the special possession of God, but as an assistant of God, originating from His own nature. Together therewith "the almighty word of God" (*ὁ παντοδύναμός σου λόγος*) is also personified in a manner which approaches hypostatic union (xviii. 15 sq.). Thus we have here already the elements, from which the Philonian doctrine of the *λόγος* (= reason and word of God) as a hypostasis mediating between God and the world is formed. For Wisdom occupies in our author a position similar to that of Philo's *Logos* with respect to the world also. She has a spirit which is easily moving, all-overseeing, all-pervading (vii. 22-24: *εὐκίνητον, πανεπίσκοπον, διήκει καὶ χωρεῖ διὰ πάντων*, etc.). She works everything (viii. 5: *τὰ πάντα*

ἐργαζομένη), rules all things (viii. 1: διοικεῖ τὰ πάντα), makes all things new (vii. 27: τὰ πάντα καινίζει). "By passing from generation to generation into holy souls, she prepares friends of God and prophets" (vii. 27). It is she who was manifested in the history of Israel, *e.g.* in the pillar of fire and cloud, which led the Israelites through the wilderness (x. 17 and chap. x. in general). Hence Wisdom is in a word the medium by which God works in the world. The tendency of this whole speculation is evidently the same as in Philo, *viz.* to secure, by the insertion of such an intermediary, the absolute supramundane nature of God, who cannot be conceived of as in direct contact with a sinful world. But it must not be lost sight of, that it is by no means our author's concern to dwell upon this thought. He desires, on the contrary, to exhibit Divine Wisdom as the supreme good. He does not seek to show that Wisdom is different from God, but, on the contrary, how near it is to Him. While then he is moving in this sphere of thought, he merely takes up a view already current among his associates.¹⁴

The *influence of Greek philosophy* is moreover shown in the details of execution. The formulae, with which the rule of wisdom in the world is described (vii. 24: διήκει, χωρεῖ; viii. 1: διοικεῖ), recall the Stoic doctrine of the world-spirit of God as the wisdom of the world immanent in and pervading it.¹⁵ The enumeration also of the four cardinal virtues (viii. 7: σωφροσύνη, φρόνησις, δικαιοσύνη, ἀνδρεία) is to be referred to Stoic influence (see Zeller as above). The psychology of the author on the other hand is Platonico-dualistic. The soul of man is pre-existent. If it is good, it enters an undefiled body (viii. 20: ἀγαθὸς ὧν ἦλθον εἰς σῶμα ἀμίαντον). The body

¹⁴ Compare on this "doctrine of Wisdom" in general: Lücke, *Commentar über das Ev. Joh.* i. p. 257 sqq. Bruch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer, ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der Philosophie*, Strassb. 1851. Oehler, *Grandzüge der alttestamentl. Weisheit*, Tüb. 1855. Grimm, *Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokr.* Pt. vi. p. 1 sq.

¹⁵ Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. (3rd ed. 1881) p. 271. Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos*, p. 192.

is only an "earthly tabernacle" for the *νοῦς* (ix. 15 : *γεῶδες σκήνος*). After a short time the body must restore the soul like a loan and then fall to dust (xv. 8). In this anthropology the territory of the Jewish view is entirely forsaken. Instead of a resurrection of the body, we have here the Greek view of the immortality of the soul.

With respect to the author's *date*, it must be regarded as certain that he succeeds Jesus the son of Sirach, but *precedes Philo*. For his standpoint is a preliminary step to Philo's. This would not in itself prove a higher antiquity. But with the near affinity of the two, it is not conceivable, that our author would have remained unaffected by Philo if he had succeeded him. There is absolutely no foundation for the notion (as *e.g.* by Weisse) of Christian origin. That the author was an Alexandrian may, by reason of the great prominence of references to Egyptian matters, be regarded as certain. On the other hand it cannot be imagined, that Philo was himself the author of this book, as was believed by some even in the time of Jerome (Hieron. *praef. in vers. libr. Salom. Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ix. 1293 sq. : "Nonnulli scriptorum veterum hunc esse Judaei Philonis affirmant"); and also by many moderns, as Luther, Joh. Gerhard, Calovius, and others (see Grimm, *Handb.* p. 21 sqq.). The authorship of Philo is entirely excluded by the difference of his sphere of thought.

The book has been used from the beginning in the *Christian Church*. Even in the *Pauline Epistles* such loud echoes are found as make St. Paul's acquaintanceship with the book probable (see Bleek, *Stud. und Krit.* 1853, pp. 340-344; on the other side, Grimm, *Exeget. Handb.* p. 35 sqq.). It is tolerably certain that it was known to Clemens Romanus (Clem. Rom. xxvii. 5 = *Sap. Sal.* xii. 12, and xi. 21; comp. also Clem. lx. 1 = *Sap.* vii. 17). In Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, c. vii. *init.*, the same is said of Christ as is said (*Sap.* ii. 23) of God. Irenaeus, in his large work on heresy, nowhere quotes indeed *Sap. Sol.*, but borrows from it (iv. 38. 3) the saying: ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἰγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ θεοῦ (*Sap.* vi. 20). With reference to this Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* v. 8. 8) says of Irenaeus: Καὶ ῥητοῖς δὲ τισιν ἐκ τῆς Σολομῶντος σοφίας κίχρηται, μονονουχὶ φάσκων "Ορασις δὲ θεοῦ περιποιητικὴ ἀφθαρσίας, ἀφθαρσία δὲ ἰγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ θεοῦ. In the βιβλίον διαλέξεων διαφέρων,

which has not come down to us, Irenaeus, according to the testimony of Eusebius, expressly quoted from the Book of Wisdom (*Hist. eccl.* v. 26: τῆς ληγομένης σοφίας Σολομῶντος μνημονεύει). Canon Muratorianus, lin. 69-71: "Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta." See also Hesse, *Das muratorische Fragment* (1873), p. 239 sqq. Tertullian, *adv. Valentinianos*, c. 2, refers to Wisd. i. 1 in the words: "ut docet ipsa Sophia, non quidem Valentini sed Salomonis." Tertullian also made use of the Book of Wisdom. Clemens Alexandrinus quotes it nine times, and frequently makes use of it besides. The express quotations are introduced as either sayings of Solomon (so *Strom.* vi. 11. 93, 14. 110, 14. 114, 15. 120-121), or of the σοφία (*Paedag.* ii. 1. 7; *Strom.* ii. 2. 5, iv. 16. 103-104, v. 14. 89), or with the formula εἰρηται (*Strom.* vi. 14. 113). Hippolytus repeatedly quotes the book as a genuine προφητεία Σολομῶν περὶ Χριστοῦ (*adv. Judaeos*, § 9 and 10 = Lagarde, p. 66 sq.), especially the passage ii. 12-20, which is also frequently interpreted in a Messianic sense by moderns (see vol. ii. p. 139).

Origen is, after the author of the Muratorian Fragment, the first to intimate a doubt with respect to the Solomonian authorship. He quotes it with the sceptical formula as ἡ ἐπιγεγραμμένη τοῦ Σολομῶντος σοφία (*in Joann.* vol. xx. c. 4 = Lommatzsch, ii. 202), ἡ σοφία ἡ ἐπιγεγραμμένη Σολομῶντος (*in Jerem. homil.* viii. 1 = Lommatzsch, xv. 193), ὁ περὶ τῆς σοφίας ἐπὶ τῶν (*Selecta in Jerem.* c. 29 = Lommatzsch, xv. 453), ἐν τῇ ἐπιγεγραμμένῃ Σολομῶντος σοφίᾳ (*contra Cels.* v. 29 = Lommatzsch, xix. 216), "in sapientia quae dicitur Salomonis, qui utique liber non ab omnibus in auctoritate habetur" (*de principiis*, iv. 33 = Lommatzsch, xxi. 472 sq.). But he quotes it almost as frequently simply as a work of Solomon. And that it is to him a canonical book is especially shown by the entire section, *de principiis*, i. 2. 5-13, where he uses the passage Wisd. vii. 25, 26 together with Col. i. 15 and Heb. i. 3 as fundamental passages from which he develops his Christology. The whole section, *de princ.* i. 2. 9-13, is nothing but an exegetical discussion of Wisd. vii. 25, 26. On the whole, there are about forty quotations from this book in Origen.

Cyprian uses the Book of Wisdom as in the fullest sense canonical. He quotes it as Sapientia Salomonis (*Testim.* ii. 14, iii. 16, 53, 58, 59, 66; *Ad Fortunatum*, c. 1), scriptura divina (*De habitu virginum*, c. 10; *Epist.* vi. 2), scriptura sancta (*Ad Demetrianum*, c. 24), or with the formulae as scriptum est (*De zelo et livore*, c. 4; *Epist.* iv. 1, lv. 22), per Salomonem docet spiritus sanctus, and the like (*De mortalitate*, c. 23; *Ad Fortunatum*, c. 12). He quotes, two or three times, passages from the Proverbs with the formula in Sapientia Salomonis

(*Testim.* iii. 1, 6, 16, 56); and once a passage from Wisdom with the formula in Ecclesiastico (*Testim.* iii. 112); but both from inadvertence, since he elsewhere decidedly distinguishes between Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom.

The *manuscripts, editions and ancient translations* (together with their editions) are the same for this book as for Ecclesiasticus (see above, p. 29), the two books being as a rule combined with each other. The *cod. Vaticanus* has been used for our book in Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha, but apparently only according to the data in Reusch (*Observ. crit.* 1861), which on their part rest upon the untrustworthy edition of the codex by Mai (see upon this, p. 11 above). Valuable contributions to the textual criticism are given in Reusch, *Observationes criticae in librum Sapientiae*, Frib. 1861. The separate edition (Reusch, *Liber Sapientiae graece*, Frib. 1858) gives the text of the Sixtine edition. An edition of the Greek text with the old Latin and the Authorized English translation: Deane, *Σοφία Σαλωμων, The Book of Wisdom, the Greek text, the Latin Vulgate and the Authorized English version, with an introduction, critical apparatus and a commentary*, Oxford 1881.

The *exegesis in general*, see above, p. 11. Commentaries: Bauermeister, *Commentarius in Sapientiam Salomonis*, Götting. 1828. Grimm, *Commentar über das Buch der Weisheit*, Leipzig 1837. J. A. Schmid, *Das Buch der Weisheit, übersetzt und erklärt*, 1858 (Cathol.). Grimm, *Das Buch der Weisheit erklärt* (*Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen*, 6 pts.), Leipzig 1860 (not a new edition of the former work, but an entirely new one). Gutberlet, *Das Buch der Weisheit, übersetzt und erklärt*, 1874 (Cathol.). Deane in the above-named separate edition. The older literature in Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, iii. 727-732. Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* iii. 219-221. Grimm, *Exeget. Handb.* p. 45 sq. Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. i. 496.

Separate investigations: Salthenius, *Diss. critico-theol. de auctore libri Sapientiae Philone potius Alexandrino quam seniore*, Regim. 1739. Bretschneider, *De libri Sapientiae parte priore c. i.-xi. e duobus libellis conflata*. Pts. i.-iii. Viteb. 1804. Winzer, *De philosophia morali in libro Sap. exposita*, Viteb. 1811. Grimm, *De Alexandrina Sapientiae libri indole perperam asserta*, Jen. 1833 (subsequently withdrawn by himself). Gfrörer, *Philo*, vol. ii. (1831) pp. 200-272. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, vol. ii. (1834) pp. 152-180. Bruch, *Weisheitslehre der Hebräer*, Strassb. 1851, pp. 322-378. Schmieder, *Ueber das B. der Weisheit*, 1853. Weisse, *Die Evangelienfrage* (1856), p. 202 sqq. Noach, *Psyche*, iii. 2, pp. 65-102. Nägelsbach in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xvii. 622 sqq. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 626 sqq.

The same, *Jahrb. der bibl. Wissensch.* iii. 264 sq., ix. 234 sq., x. 219 sq., xi. 223 sqq. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), pp. 271–274. Kübel, “Die ethischen Grundanschauungen der Weisheit Salomo’s” (*Stud. und Krit.* 1865, pp. 690–722). Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos* (1872), pp. 192–202. Fritzsche in Schenkel’s *Bibell. v.* 647 sqq. Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. ii. 259 sqq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iii. (3rd ed. 1878) pp. 628–630 (note 3). Perez, *La Sapienza di Salomone, saggio storico-critico*, Firenze 1871. The same, *Sopra Filone Alessandrino e il suo libro detto, “La Sapienza di Salomone,”* Palermo 1883. The Introductions of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Welte, Scholz, Nöldeke, De Wette-Schrader, Reusch, Keil, Kaulen, Kleinert, Reuss (see above, p. 12).

2. *Aristobulus.*

The author of the Wisdom of Solomon is one whose views are still chiefly based upon the Palestinian Proverbial Wisdom, which in him is only peculiarly modified by the influence of Greek philosophy. The Alexandrian Aristobulus on the contrary is a Hellenistic philosopher in the proper sense. He is acquainted with, and expressly quotes the Greek philosophers Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and is at home with their views as a philosopher by profession.

The statements of the ancients do not indeed entirely agree as to his date. It may however pass for certain that he lived in the time of Ptolemy VI. Philometor, and therefore towards the middle of the second century before Christ (about 170–150 B.C.). He himself says, in one of his works addressed to a Ptolemy, that the Greek translation of the Pentateuch was made “under King Philadelphus, thy ancestor” (Euseb. *Præp. evang.* xiii. 12. 2, ed. Gaisford: ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως, σοῦ δὲ προγόνου). Thus he at all events wrote under a descendant of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus. But both Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius in his *Chronicle* distinctly mention Philometor.¹⁶ The same

¹⁶ Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 22. 150: Ἀριστόβουλος ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν πρὸς τὸν Φιλαμήτορα. The reading here is guaranteed, for in Eusebius also, who

chronology is also presupposed, when Clemens Alexandrinus and Eusebius identify this Aristobulus with the one who is mentioned in the beginning of the second Book of Maccabees (2 Macc. i. 10).¹⁷ In opposition to such evidence, it cannot be taken into consideration, that Anatolius places him under Ptolemy II. Philadelphus,¹⁸ and that the only manuscript of the *Stromata* of Clemens Alexandrinus has erroneously Philadelphus instead of Philometor in one passage.¹⁹

According to Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 97, this Aristobulus wrote βιβλία ἱκανά. Probably Clemens does not mean to say that he wrote several books, but that the one work which he knew of his was an extensive one. We are indebted for further particulars to Clemens Alexandrinus (*Strom.* i. 15. 72, i. 22. 150, v. 14. 97, vi. 3. 32), Anatolius (in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32, 16–19, Anatolius was an older contemporary of Eusebius) and Eusebius (*Praep. evang.* vii. 14, viii. 10, xiii. 12). Aristobulus is also briefly mentioned by Origen (*contra Cels.* iv. 51). The only two passages which are verbally preserved are in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 10 and xiii. 12. For whatever other verbal quotations are found (Clemens, *Strom.* i. 22. 150 = Euseb. *Praep.* ix. 6. Clemens, *Strom.* vi. 3. 32 = Euseb. *Praep.* vii. 14) are certainly contained also in the text of these larger fragments.²⁰ The passage, which Cyrillus Alex. (*contra Julian.* p. 134, ed. Spanh.)

in the *Praep. evang.* ix. 6 gives this passage from Clemens, the manuscripts all have Φιλομήτορα. Euseb. *Chron. ad Olymp.* 151 (ed. Schoene, ii. 124 sq.). The Greek text, which is preserved in the *Chronicon paschale*, is as follows: 'Αριστόβουλος Ἰουδαῖος περιπατήτικὸς φιλόσοφος ἔγνωρίζετο, ὃς Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Φιλομήτορι ἐξηγήσαίς τῆς Μωϋσίου γραφῆς ἀνέθηκεν. So too the Armenian and Jerome. The 151st Olympiad = 176–172 B.C.

¹⁷ Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 97. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 9, *fin.*

¹⁸ Anatolius in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 16.

¹⁹ Clemens, *Strom.* v. 14. 97. The *cod. Laurentianus*, i.e. the only manuscript in which the *Stromata* of Clemens has come down to us (for the *Parisinus*, saec. 15, is only a copy from it), has here Φιλάδελφον. Modern editors have however correctly replaced it by Φιλομήτορα.

²⁰ Namely: (1) Clem. *Str.* i. 22. 450 = Eus. *Pr.* ix. 6 = Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 1. (2) Clem. *Strom.* vi. 3. 32 = Eus. *Pr.* viii. 10. 14. (3) Eus. *Pr.* vii. 14 = Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 10–11.

ascribes to Aristobulus, is derived from the third Book of the *Indica* of Megasthenes, and has been only ascribed to Aristobulus in consequence of a very inconsiderate use of Clem. Al. *Strom.* i. 15. 72.

The work which was in the hands of these Fathers is designated as *an explanation of the Mosaic laws*.²¹ According however to the fragments preserved, we must conceive of it not as an actual commentary on the text, but as a *free reproduction of the contents of the Pentateuch*, in which the latter is philosophically explained. Hence it is not Philo's allegorical commentaries on single passages of the text, but his systematic delineation of the Mosaic legislation, the characteristics of which have been described p. 219 above, which is analogous to it. Like Philo, Aristobulus already seems to have given a connected representation of the contents of the Pentateuch, for the purpose of showing to the cultured heathen world, that the Mosaic law, if only correctly understood, already contained all that the best Greek philosophers subsequently taught. The work was first of all intended for King Ptolemy Philometor himself,²² who is therefore addressed in the text (Eus. *Pr.* viii. 10. 1 sqq., xiii. 12. 2). Hence it is self-evident, that it is addressed simply to heathen readers. His chief object was, as Clement says, to show "that the peripatetic philosophy was dependent upon the law of Moses and the other prophets" (*Strom.* v. 14. 97: 'Αριστοβούλῃ . . . βιβλία πεπώνηται ἱκανά, δι' ὧν ἀποδείκνυσιν τὴν περιπατητικὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἔκ τε τοῦ κατὰ Μωυσέα

²¹ Euseb. *Praep. evang.* vii. 13. 7, ed. Gaisford: τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων ἑρμηνείαν. Euseb. *Chron. ad Olymp.* 151 (ed. Schoene, ii. 124 sq.): ἐξηγήσεις τῆς Μωυσέως γραφῆς (this Greek wording, preserved by means of the *Chron. paschale*, is confirmed by the Armenian [enarrationem librorum Moysis] and by Jerome [explanationem in Moysen commentarios]). Anatolius in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 16: βίβλους ἐξηγητικὰς τοῦ Μωϋσέως νόμου.

²² Clemens Al. *Strom.* i. 22. 150=Eus. *Praep. evang.* ix. 6. 6: ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν πρὸς τὸν Φιλομήτορα. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 9, fin.: ἐν τῇ πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον τὸν βασιλεῖα συγγράμματι. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* vii. 13, fin. Anatolius in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 16.

νόμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἡρτῆσθαι προφητῶν). This is substantially confirmed by the fragments preserved, only instead of the peripatetic the Greek philosophy in general should rather be spoken of. For Aristobulus is not contented with exhibiting the intrinsic agreement of the Mosaic law with the philosophy of the Greeks, but roundly asserts *that the Greek philosophers, a Pythagoras, a Socrates, a Plato, derived their doctrines from Moses*, nay, that even the poets *Homer and Hesiod* borrowed much from him, for that the essential contents of the Pentateuch had been rendered into Greek long before the Greek translation of the Pentateuch made under Ptolemy Philadelphus.²³ This bold assertion, that Moses was the father of Greek philosophy and culture, was embraced also by later Jewish Hellenists. Especially do we again meet with it in Philo.

The fragments preserved give us at least an approximate notion of the execution in detail. A large portion of the passages are employed in settling the true sense of the Biblical anthropomorphisms. Thus *e.g.* the long passage in Euseb. *Pr. evang.* xiii. 12. 1–8, which, according to the parallel passage in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 22. 150 = Euseb. *Pr.* ix. 6, is taken from the first book of Aristobulus' work, and evidently belonged to the explanation of the history of the Creation, shows, that nothing else is meant by the words "God said, and it was," than that everything came to pass by the operation (*δυνάμει*) of God, as indeed was taught by the Greek philosophers Orpheus and Aratus. The following passage (Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 9–16), which also belonged to the explanation of the history of the Creation, treats of the seventh day as the day of rest, and explains its meaning by an appeal, among other things, to supposed verses of Hesiod, Homer, and Linus.²⁴ Another passage (Eus. *Pr.* viii. 10)

²³ See especially Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 1 = Clemens, *Strom.* i. 22. 150 = Euseb. *Praep.* ix. 6. 6–8. Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato: Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 4, ed. Gaisford. Homer and Hesiod: Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 13.

²⁴ A small portion of this (Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 12. 10–11) is also found *Pr. evang.* vii. 14.

shows what we are to understand, when the hands, arms, face and feet of God, or a walking of God, are spoken of.²⁵ Lastly, the extract from Anatolius, given in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 17–18, is occupied with the Passover, which is celebrated, when both the sun and moon are in the equinox, viz. the sun in the vernal, and the moon opposite him in the autumnal equinox. Just this fragment shows, that Aristobulus by no means occupied himself with only philosophically explaining away the text of the Pentateuch, but that he really gave a description and explanation of the Mosaic law. While endeavouring however to settle its meaning, he often enters, as Origen especially intimates (*contra Cels.* iv. 51), into the region of allegorical interpretation.

The fragments give no further disclosure concerning the *philosophical standpoint* of Aristobulus. It may without any hesitation be assumed that he was an eclectic. The fragment on the meaning of the Sabbath "enters into a Pythagorean-like dilation on the power of the number seven."²⁶ Elsewhere Aristobulus appeals not only generally to Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato, but, when entering more into detail, to the peripatetic doctrine in particular.²⁷ That he the more closely adhered to the latter is vouched for by the Fathers, who unanimously call him a *peripatetic*.²⁸

It is almost incomprehensible, that many more recent scholars (e.g. Richard Simon, Hody, Eichhorn, Kuenen, Grätz, Joel) should have disputed the genuineness of the whole work of Aristobulus. The picture, which we obtain from the fragments of the work that have come down to us, so entirely coincides with all that we elsewhere learn of the intellectual tendency of Hellenistic Judaism, that there is absolutely no occasion for any kind of doubt. The sole reason against the

²⁵ A small sentence from it is found in Eus. *Pr.* viii. 10. 14; also in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 3. 32.

²⁶ Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. (3rd ed.) p. 264.

²⁷ Eus. *Pr.* ev. xiii. 12. 10–11 = vii. 14.

²⁸ Clemens, *Strom.* i. 15. 72, v. 14. 97. Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 9, *fin.*, ix. 6. 6. *Chron. ad Olymp.* 151 (ed. Schoene, ii. 124 sq.).

genuineness, which at all deserves mention, is the certainly indisputable fact that Aristobulus cites supposed verses of Orpheus, Hesiod, Homer, and Linus, which are certainly forged by a Jew. It is thought, that such audacity is inconceivable in a work intended for King Ptolemy himself. The assumption on which the argument starts is, that the verses were forged by Aristobulus himself—an assumption not only incapable of proof, but in the highest degree improbable. The verses were probably derived from an older Jewish work (see on this point No. VII.), and adopted by Aristobulus in all good faith in their genuineness. Aristobulus only did what later Christian apologists have also done, without thereby affording a ground for doubting the genuineness of their works.

The entire work of Aristobulus is said, according to a marginal note in the cod. Laurentianus of Clemens Alexandrinus' Stromata, to have been still extant towards the close of the Middle Ages in a library at Patmos (on Strom. i. 22. 150, a hand of the fifteenth or sixteenth century remarks: 'Αριστοβούλου βίβλος αὕτη ἢ πρὸς τὸν Φιλομήτορα ἴσταν εἰς τὴν Πάτμον, ἣν ἔγωγε οἶδα; see the note in Dindorf's ed.). Whether this note is worthy of credence is however very doubtful.

Compare in general: Richard Simon, *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*, pp. 189, 499. Hody, *De bibliorum textibus*, p. 50 sqq. Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, i. 164, iii. 469 sq. Eichhorn, *Allgem. Bibliothek der biblischen Literatur*, vol. v. (1793) pp. 253–298. Valckenaer, *Diatribē de Aristobulo Judaeo, philosopho peripatetico Alexandrino*, Lugd. Bat. 1806 (chief work). Gabler's *Journal für auserlesene theolog. Literatur*, vol. v. (1810) pp. 183–209 (advertisement of Valckenaer's work). Winer in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encyclop.* § 1, vol. v. (1820) p. 266. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, i. (1829) p. 448. Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 711–21. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, ii. 73–112. Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i. 53 sq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 473 sqq., 564 sqq. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 335 sqq. Teuffel in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* i. 2 (2nd ed.), p. 1600. Cobet in the *Λογος Ἐρμης*, i. (1866) pp. 173–177, 521. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed.), pp. 257–264. Ueberweg, *Grundriss*, 4th ed. i. 240 sqq. Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 2 pts. Glogau 1869–1870 (Gymnasialprogr.). Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos* (1872), pp. 185–192. Kuenen, *De godsdiens van Israël*, ii. (1870) pp. 433–440. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, pp. 166–169.

Grätz, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1878, pp. 49–60, 97–109. Joel, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte zu Anfang des zweiten christlichen Jahrhunderts* (1880), pp. 77–100.

3. Philo.

Philo, the more recent fellow-countryman of Aristobulus by two centuries, represents the same tendency. His main effort also is to prove, that the views derived from Greek philosophers were genuinely Jewish. And this he does now for heathen, now for Jewish readers; for the former to inspire them with respect for Judaism, for the latter to educate them to such a Judaism as he himself represents. It may safely be assumed, that there were between Aristobulus and Philo other representatives of this tendency. For it presented itself in Philo with such assurance, and in such maturity of form, as would not be conceivable without historical connection. Nothing however of the supposed literary productions of such individuals has come down to us.

Since Philo, by reason of his eminent importance and the extent of his extant works, demands a separate delineation (§ 34), we will here only briefly mention those writings of his in which philosophical instruction and discussion form the main object. Among these are in the first place two of his principal works on the Pentateuch, viz.: (1) the *Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*, a short explanation of Genesis and Exodus in the form of questions and answers; and (2) the *Νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι*, the extensive allegorical commentaries on select passages of Genesis, in the form of Rabbinical Midrash. These form Philo's chief philosophical work properly so called, and constitute in extent about the half of Philo's still extant writings. (3) The work, *Περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεύθερον* (*Quod omnis probus liber*), properly only the second half of a work, whose first half, which is lost, dealt with the theme *περὶ τοῦ δούλου εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον*, was also occupied in the discussion of philosophical questions. (4) *Περὶ προνοίας*. (5) *Ἀλέξανδρος ἢ περὶ τοῦ λόγον ἔχειν τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα*. Particulars concerning

all these works will be found in § 34. The two last-named are also of interest, because Philo in them chooses the form of the Greek dialogue in discussing the theme.

4. *The Fourth Book of Maccabees.*

To philosophical literature belongs also the so-called fourth Book of Maccabees. For the Judaism, which the author recommends, is influenced by the Stoic philosophy.

In its *form* this piece of writing is a *discourse*. It directly addresses its hearers or readers (i. 1, xviii. 1).²⁹ The contents being of a religious and edifying kind, it might even be called a *sermon*, and the choice of this form referred to the custom of religious lectures in the synagogues. But when Freudenthal (pp. 4–36) emphatically insists that we have here an actual specimen of synagogue preaching, this is not only incapable of proof, but also improbable, the theme discoursed on being not a text of Holy Scripture, but a philosophic proposition.

The author had only Jews in view, whether as hearers or readers (xviii. 1: ὁ τῶν Ἀβραμιαίων σπερμάτων ἀπόγονοι παῖδες Ἰσραηλῖται). He desires to show them, that it is not difficult to lead a pious life, if only they follow the precepts of “pious reason.” For “*pious reason is the absolute ruler of the motives*” (i. 1: αὐτοδέσποτός ἐστι τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβῆς λογισμός). This proposition is the proper theme of the discourse; its meaning is first explained, and its truth afterwards proved by facts from Jewish history, especially by the laudable martyrdom of Eleazar, and the seven Maccabaeian brothers. A large portion of the contents is therefore devoted to a description of the martyrdom of these heroes of faith. In his grossly realistic delineation of the several tortures, the author shows even greater want of taste than the second Book of Maccabees, and the psychology assumed is as contrary as possible to nature. His authority seems to have been the second Book of

²⁹ I quote according to the division into chapters and verses of Fritzsche's edition of the Apocrypha.

Maccabees. At least it cannot be proved that he drew, as Freudenthal (pp. 72-90) supposes, from the larger work of Jason of Cyrene (2 Macc. ii. 23).

The author's own *standpoint* is influenced by *Stoicism*. The fundamental idea of the whole discourse is that of Stoic morality, viz. the rule of reason over impulse. The setting up too of four cardinal virtues (*φρόνησις, δικαιοσύνη, ἀνδρεία, σωφροσύνη*) is derived from Stoicism. But this influence of Stoicism does not anywhere penetrate more deeply with the author. Even the fundamental idea is transformed in Jewish fashion. For the reason, to which he ascribes dominion over desire, is not human reason as such, but *pious* reason: *ὁ εὐσεβῆς λογισμός* (i. 1, vii. 16, xiii. 1, xv. 20, xvi. 1, xviii. 2), i.e. reason *guiding itself according to the rule of the divine law* (comp. also i. 15 sq.). He also goes his own way in the description and division of the affections (see Freudenthal, p. 55 sqq.; Zeller, iii. 2. 276). But it would be doing him too much honour to designate him as an eclectic philosopher. He is but a dilettante *in philosophicis*, somewhat after the fashion of Josephus, who also knows how to give his Judaism a philosophic tinge. Of all Jewish philosophers known to us, our author stands relatively nearest to Pharisaism, for just what he extols in the Maccabean brethren is their punctilious adherence to the ceremonial law. Two of his Jewish views in particular may be brought forward as worthy of notice—(1) his belief in the resurrection, the form of which is not that of the Pharisaic belief in that doctrine, but the form met with among other Jewish Hellenists, of a faith in an eternal and blessed life of pious souls in heaven (xiii. 16, xv. 2, xvii. 5, xviii. *fin.*);³⁰ and (2) the notion that the martyrdom of the righteous serves as an atonement for the

³⁰ For further particulars, see Grimm, *Exeget. Handb.* p. 289, and Freudenthal, pp. 67-71. Caution is however needed in the settlement of details, because the text seems to be not quite free from Christian interpolations. See Freudenthal, p. 165 sqq. Such an interpolation are the words *ἐν τοῖς κόλποις αὐτῶν*, which are wanting in the cod. Alex. and Sin. The thought however remains the same even without these words.

sins of the people (vi. 29: καθάρσιον αὐτῶν ποιήσον τὸ ἐμὸν αἷμα, καὶ ἀντίψυχον αὐτῶν λάβε τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχὴν; xvii. 29: ἀντίψυχον γεγονότας τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἁμαρτίας).⁸¹

Josephus is named by Eusebius and other Church writers as the *author* of this book. This view however has only the value of a hypothesis. For the book still appears in many manuscripts anonymously, and was therefore certainly at first issued without the name of the author. The entirely different style, and the circumstance, that Josephus in his *Antiquities* nowhere makes use of the second Book of Maccabees and thus seems not to know it, while the work in question is entirely based upon it, speak against his authorship. The first century after Christ is generally accepted as the *date of composition*, chiefly because the book must have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Though the latter cannot be proved, this view must be pretty nearly correct, since a more recent book would no longer have been accepted by the Christian Church.

Eusebius, speaking of the writings of Josephus, says concerning the *title* and *authorship*, *Hist. eccl.* iii. 10. 6: Περὶ οὗ καὶ ἄλλο οὐκ ἀγενὲς σοῦδασμα τῷ ἀνδρὶ περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ, ὃ τινες Μακκαβαίων ἐπέγραψαν κ.τ.λ. Hieronymus, *De viris illustr.* c. 13 (Vallarsi, ii. 851): "Alius quoque liber ejus, qui inscribitur περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ valde elegans habetur, in quo et Machabaeorum sunt digesta martyria." The same, *contra Pelagianos*, ii. 6 (Vallarsi, ii. 749): "Unde et Josephus Machabaeorum scriptor historiae frangi et regi posse dixit perturbationes animi non eradicari (= 4 Macc. iii. 5)." The article in Suidas, *Lex. s.v. Ἰώσηπος*, is taken from the Greek translation of Hieron. *de viris illustris*, c. 13. For other authors who attribute this book to Josephus, see Grimm, *Handb.* p. 293 sq. It is also frequently attributed to Josephus in the MSS. (Grimm as above. Freudenthal, p. 117 sqq.). Its title as the fourth Book of Maccabees (Μακκαβαίων δ') is found in Philostorgius and Syncellus, and in some Scripture MSS., and indeed in the latter without the mention of Josephus as its author (so esp. *cod. Alex.* and *Sin.*). For further particulars, see Freudenthal, pp. 117-120. On the use of the book in Christian ascetic literature, see above, p. 214.

⁸¹ Comp. Freudenthal, p. 68.

The *manuscripts*, in which our book has come down, are *some of them manuscripts of Scripture, some of Josephus*. The former are not numerous, since as a rule only three books of Maccabees were received as canonical (Freudenthal, pp. 118, 119). Still the two most important manuscripts for our book are Scripture MSS., viz. the *codex Alexandrinus* (No. iii. in Fritzsche) and *Sinaiticus* (No. x. in Fritzsche). On the editions of these manuscripts, see above, p. 166. More concerning them will be found in Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* v. 26 sq. Grimm, *Handb.* p. 294. Freudenthal, pp. 120–127, 169 sq., 173. Fritzsche, *Prolegom.* p. xxi. sq. Collations chiefly in Havercamp's edition of *Josephus*, ii. 1. 497 sqq., ii. 2. 157 sqq. A fragment in Tischendorf, *Monumenta sacra inedita*, vol. vi. 1869. Various readings of a Florentine MS. (*Acquis. ser.* iii. No. 44) are given by Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, vol. ii. (1884) pp. 635–640.

The text is *printed* in accordance with the manuscripts, on the one hand in some editions of the Septuagint and in separate editions of the Apocrypha, on the other and chiefly in the *editions of Josephus*. Most of the editors have troubled themselves very little about the manuscripts. The first attempt at a recension of the text from the best authorities is made in Fritzsche's edition of the *Libri apocryphi Vet. Test. graece* (Lips. 1871). For more on the editions, see Grimm, *Handb.* p. 294 sq. Freudenthal, pp. 127–133.

Erasmus compiled a *Latin paraphrase* of this book (printed e.g. in Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 148–156). Nothing reliable is as yet known of any *ancient Latin translation* on which it is based. See Grimm, p. 296. Freudenthal, p. 133 sqq. The old *Syriac translation* is published in Ceriani's photo-lithographic edition of the Milan Peshito manuscript (see above, p. 92).

Grimm has given a careful commentary on this book in his *Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokryphen*, 4 parts, Leipzig 1857. Freudenthal's *Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift Ueber die Herrschaft der Vernunft* (4 Makkabäerbuch), *eine Predigt aus dem ersten nachchristlichen Jahrhundert, untersucht*, Breslau 1869, is a complete monograph. A German translation is contained in the *Bibliothek der griechischen und römischen Schriftsteller über Judenthum und Juden in neuen Uebertragungen und Sammlungen*, 2 vols. Leipzig 1867.

Comp. in general: Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 173–200. Dähne, *Geshichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, ii. 190–199. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 632 sqq. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina* (1866), pp. 74–83. Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, 1869, pp. 113–116. Fritzsche in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* iv. 98–100. Keil, *Einkl. in's*

A. T., 3rd ed. (1873) p. 722 sqq. Grätz, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1877, p. 454 sqq. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, § 570. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), pp. 275-277.

VI. APOLOGETICS.

The peculiarity of the Jewish people involved the circumstance that the Jews were felt to be, more than other Orientals, an anomaly in the framework of the Graeco-Roman world. Denying all authority to other religions, they were paid in the same coin, and their right of existence upon the soil of Hellenistic culture disputed. The town municipalities tried to get rid of such inconvenient fellow-citizens; the populace was always ready to lift up a hand against them, while by the educated they were despised and derided (see vol. ii. pp. 273-276, 291). Hellenistic Judaism thus found itself continually at war with the rest of the Hellenistic world; it had ever to draw the sword in its own defence. *Hence a large share of the entire Graeco-Jewish literature subserves apologetic purposes.* Especially does the historic and philosophic literature essentially pursue the design of showing that the Jewish nation was, by reason of the greatness of its history and the purity of its teaching, if not superior, at least equal to others. Besides these indirectly apologetic works, there were also some *which sought in a systematic manner to refute the reproaches with which Judaism was assailed.* These were called forth by the sometimes utterly absurd fables propagated by certain Greek literati concerning the Jews, and generally by the direct accusations brought against them in Greek and Latin literature. These accusations had their rise in Egypt (*Joseph. contra Apion.* i. 25). Alexandrian literati were the first to write against the Jews. From these turbid waters later writers, especially Tacitus, drew. In what follows we shall speak in the first place of literary opponents, and afterwards of the apologetic works and the points of dispute themselves (Attack and Defence).

1. *The Literary Opponents.*

1. *Manetho* (comp. Josephus, *contra Apion.* i. 26-31). The Egyptian priest Manetho composed, in the time of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus, therefore about 270-250 B.C., a learned work on Egyptian history in the Greek language, derived from the sacred records themselves (Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 14: γέγραφε Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ τὴν πάτριον ἱστορίαν, ἔκ τε τῶν ἱερῶν, ὡς φησὶν αὐτός, μεταφράσας. *Ibid.* i. 26: ὁ τὴν Αἰγυπτιακὴν ἱστορίαν ἐκ τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων μεθερμηνεύειν ὑπεσχημένος). From these *Αἰγυπτιακά* of Manetho Josephus gives in two places long fragments, which however, as Josephus himself states, are of very different character. The portions (from the second Book of the *Αἰγυπτιακά*) in i. 14-16, which treat of the rule of the Hyksos in Egypt, make, by the copiousness of their contents and the conciseness of their form, the most favourable impression. Nothing in them gives occasion for doubting that their contents are really derived from the ancient records. Of quite another kind are the portions in i. 26, 27. These do not indeed pretend to be authentic history, but only give, according to Manetho's own confession, *the legends current concerning the Jews* (i. 16: ὁ Μανεθὼν οὐκ ἐκ τῶν παρ' Αἰγυπτίους γραμμάτων, ἀλλ' ὡς αὐτὸς ὠμολόγηκεν, ἐκ τῶν ἀδεσπότης μυθολογουμένων προστέθεικεν. I. 26: μέχρι μὲν τούτων ἠκολούθησε ταῖς ἀναγραφαῖς, ἔπειτα δὲ δοὺς ἐξουσίαν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ φάναι γράφειν τὰ μυθεύμενα καὶ λεγόμενα περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, λόγους ἀπιθάνους παρενέβαλεν). It is here related, how King Amenophis of Egypt assembled in one place all the lepers of the country, 80,000 in number, and sent them to work in the stone quarries east of the Nile. After they had laboured there a long time they petitioned the king to assign to them the town of Auaris, which had formerly been inhabited by the Hyksos, as a place of residence. The king granted their request. When however they had taken possession of the

town, they were attacked by the king and chose a priest of Heliopolis named Osarsiph as their head, who gave them new laws, in which they were especially commanded to worship no gods and to kill the sacred animals. He also invoked the aid of the Hyksos from Jerusalem as allies. With their assistance the lepers now drove away King Amenophis and ruled Egypt for thirteen years. The priest Osarsiph then took the name of Moses. After the thirteen years the Hyksos and the lepers were driven out of Egypt by King Amenophis. This history concerning the origin of the Jews was therefore read in his text of Manetho by Josephus. Whether it is derived from Manetho himself is questionable. Many recent investigators, e.g. Boeckh, Carl Müller, Kellner, regard it as a later insertion.³² The possibility of its being such cannot be disputed, since this much read work already existed in various recensions even in the time of Josephus.³³ This view does not however appear to me to be probable in the case in question. For if an enemy of the Jews had subsequently inserted the passage, he would scarcely have been so truthful as expressly to bring forward the fact, that he was not giving a history accredited by ancient records, but only *τὰ μυθεύόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. In these words we hear the strict investigator, who indeed as an enemy of the Jews cannot deny himself the reporting of these tales, but expressly distinguishes them as legends from authentic history. At any rate Josephus read the section in all the copies known to him of Manetho; for he says nothing of any difference in this respect.³⁴

³² Boeckh, *Manetho und die Hundsternperiode*, p. 302. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* ii. 514^b. Kellner, *De fragmentis Manethonianis*, p. 52 sq.

³³ In the passage, i. 14, Josephus gives a long extract from Manetho, in which the name *Hyksos* is explained by "Shepherd Kings." On this Josephus remarks, that "in another copy" (*ἑν ἄλλῃ ἀντιγράφῳ*) another explanation is given. *Ἐν ἄλλῃ δὲ τινὶ βίβλῳ* (i. 14 near the end) must be understood in the same sense, i.e. of another manuscript, not of another part of Manetho's work.

³⁴ It must not be urged (as by Kellner) against the origin of the section in question, that it is contradictory to the passage given, i. 14. Such a

The fragments of Manetho are best collected in Carl Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, vol. ii. (1848) pp. 511-616. Comp. on Manetho in general: Böckh, *Manetho und die Hundsternperiode, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Pharaonen*, Berlin 1845. Bähr in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iv. 1477 sqq. Nicolai, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, 2nd ed. vol. ii. (1876) pp. 198-200. Krall, "Die Composition und die Schicksale des Manethonischen Geschichtswerkes" (*Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie, philos.-histor. Classe*, vol. xcv., yearly course 1879, pp. 123-226), treats, pp. 152-169, especially of the fragments in Josephus.

On the fragments in Josephus: Hengstenberg, *Die Bücher Moses und Aegypten*, with an appendix: *Manetho und die Hyksos*, Berlin 1841. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel* (3rd ed.), ii. 110 sqq. Kellner, *De fragmentis Manethonianis, quae apud Josephum contra Apionem*, i. 14 and i. 26 sunt., Marburg 1859. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavii Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (Basel 1877), pp. 120 sqq., 185 sqq., 214 sqq.

2. *Apollonius Molon* (or *Molonis*?). Among the literary opponents of Judaism Josephus frequently names one *Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μόλων* (*contra Apion*. ii. 14, ii. 36), in a later passage *ὁ Μόλων Ἀπολλώνιος* (comp. ii. 7: *Apollonium Molonis*), whose full name he also abridges so as to write either only *Ἀπολλώνιος* (ii. 14 and ii. 37, twice) or only *Μόλων* (ii. 2, ed. Bekker, 226. 13; comp. ii. 33 and ii. 41: *Μόλωνες*). This adversary of the Jews in Josephus is undoubtedly identical with him, from whom Alexander Polyhistor gives a passage (in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 19: *ὁ δὲ τὴν συσκευὴν τὴν κατὰ Ἰουδαίων γράψας Μόλων*).³⁵ An orator of the same name (Apollonius Molon) is elsewhere frequently mentioned as the teacher of Cicero and Caesar and as a writer on rhetoric.³⁶ It seems however that some discrepancies had already crept in concerning him among the ancients. For

contradiction only exists if the Hyksos are identified—as by Josephus—with the Jews, which is certainly a mistake.

³⁵ The form *Μόλων* is given by Gaisford according to the better manuscripts; other editions have *Μήλων*.

³⁶ Quintilian, xii. 6. 7. Sueton. *Caesar*, 4. Quintilian, iii. 1. 16. Phobammon in *Rhetores graeci*, ed. Walz, viii. 494 (here *Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Μόλων*).

Strabo distinguishes two orators, an Apollonius and a Molon, evidently by reason of a more accurate knowledge of the matter. He mentions both (xiv. 2. 13, p. 655) as eminent men, who lived in Rhodes, and remarks that both came from Alabanda in Caria, but that Molon came to Rhodes subsequently to Apollonius, on which account Apollonius said to him, "ὄφ' ἐ μολών." Thus they were not only fellow-countrymen but contemporaries. Strabo also distinguishes them in another passage, in which he is enumerating the eminent men of Alabanda (xiv. 2. 26, p. 661). Cicero too mentions both, and indeed so that he calls the one only Apollonius, and the other, who was Cicero's tutor, only Molon.⁸⁷ Hence we must certainly distinguish between the two. Apollonius however was called by his full name, Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ τοῦ Μόλωνος (Plutarch. Cicero 4, Caesar 3; Joseph. *Apion*. ii. 7); and he seems, by placing his father's name beside his own, according to a custom which may be pointed to elsewhere, to have called himself Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μόλων.^{87a} This gave rise to his being frequently confounded with Molon. Cicero had probably heard both, but his own teacher was Molon. We are here concerned, not with the latter, but with his older fellow-countryman Apollonius, who, according to Cicero, was already a noted teacher 120 years before Christ.⁸⁸

There existed before the end of the second century before

⁸⁷ For proof, see Riese, *Molon or Apollonius Molon?* (*Rhein. Museum*, 1879, pp. 627-630), from which the above details concerning the distinctness of the two men is taken.

^{87a} Comp. *Quaestiones epicae*, 1837, p. 23, note (with appeal to Sturz, *Opp.* p. 14). The supposition of Riese, that the name Apollonius Molon originated in a misunderstanding of the title-superscription Ἀπολλωνίου τοῦ Μόλωνος, is, according to what has been said, neither necessary nor probable.

⁸⁸ Cicero makes Scaevola say, *De orat.* i. 17. 75: "Quae, cum ego praetor Rhodum venissem et cum illo summo doctore istius disciplinae Apollonio ea quae a Panaetio acceperam contulissem, irrisit ille quidem, ut solebat, philosophiamque contempsit," etc. Scaevola was praetor about A.U.C. 638=121 B.C. (see Pauly's *Enc.* v. 183). Cicero also mentions this same Apollonius, *De oratore*, i. 28. 126 (*Alabandensem Apollonium*) and i. 28. 130. *De inventione*, i. 56. 109.

Christ, in Caria and Rhodes, sufficient occasion for the composition of a polemical work against the Jews by a living orator. For we know that just here the Jews were already numerous dispersed during the second century B.C.³⁹ The work of Apollonius was, according to Alexander Polyhistor, a *συσκευή κατὰ Ἰουδαίων* (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 19). Hence it dealt not merely occasionally, like Manetho's *Αἰγυπτιακά*, but exclusively with the Jews. As Josephus says Apollonius did not, like Apion, heap up his accusations in one place, but calumniated the Jews in many passages and throughout the work now in one manner now in another (*contra Apion.* ii. 14: *τὴν κατηγορίαν ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος οὐκ ἀθρόαν ὥσπερ ὁ Ἀπίων ἔταξεν, ἀλλὰ σποράδην καὶ διὰ πάσης τῆς συγγραφῆς . . . λοιδορεῖ*), hence it must be supposed that the work was *not* a purely polemical one, but that, in connection with statements concerning the Jews, it contained much polemical invective. This is also thoroughly confirmed by the fact, that the fragment in Alexander Polyhistor (Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 19) is occupied in a purely objective manner with the history of Abraham. It follows from the allusions of Josephus, that the history of the exodus from Egypt was also treated of (*contra Apion.* ii. 2), and that the work "contained unjust and untrue reports concerning our legislator Moses and our laws" (ii. 14). In the latter respect we learn also that Apollonius reproached the Jews with "not worshipping the same gods as others" (ii. 7), with having no fellowship with those who believed differently (ii. 36), and with being therefore *ἄθεοι* and *μισάνθρωποι*, also as at one time cowardly, at another fanatic, as the most incapable among barbarians, and as having furnished nothing towards general culture (ii. 14). Josephus on his part repays Apollonius in

³⁹ Comp. 1 Macc. xv. 16-24 and Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 221. The Carian towns of Myndos, Halicarnassus and Cnidus and the neighbouring islands of Cos and Rhodes are presupposed (1 Macc. xv. 16-24 and elsewhere) to be abodes of the Jews. On Halicarnassus, comp. also Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 258 (Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 10, 23).

his own coin, reproaching him with gross want of sense, arrogance and immoral conduct (ii. 36, 37).

Comp. on Apollonius in general: C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 208 sq. Creuzer, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 83 sq. Teuffel in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* i. 2 (2nd ed.), p. 1318. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavii Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), p. 230. Riese, "Molon oder Apollonius Molon?" (*Rheinisches Museum*, vol. xxxiv. Jahrg. 1879, pp. 627-630).

3. *Lysimachus* (comp. Josephus, *contra Apion.* i. 34-35). The fragment which Josephus, *ibid.*, gives from the work of a certain Lysimachus relates to the departure of the Jews from Egypt, and narrates concerning it similar fables, but still more absurd than those told by Manetho. The few occasional notices which Josephus elsewhere (*contra Apion.* ii. 2, twice, and ii. 14) gives, refer to the same fact. According to *contra Apion.* ii. 2: 'Απίων . . . τὸν αὐτὸν Λυσιμάχῳ σχεδιάσας, he seems to have been Apion's predecessor. From the tenor of the fragment it may be assumed that he was an Egyptian. According to Cosmas Indicopleustes, the work from which the fragment is taken is said to have been a "History of Egypt."⁴⁰ Since however Cosmas evidently derives his information only from Josephus, and erroneously reckons Apollonius Molon among the *Αἰγυπτιακὰ συγγραψάμενοι*, and nothing else is known of the *Αἰγυπτιακά* of Lysimachus, the matter must be left uncertain. Two works, *Θηβαϊκὰ παράδοξα* and *Νίστοι* (returns, *reversiones*, i.e. of Greek heroes from Troy), of an author named Lysimachus are frequently cited elsewhere in ancient literature. As the author of the *Νίστοι* seems to have been an Alexandrian and to have lived in the first century before Christ, he is probably identical with this Lysimachus.

⁴⁰ Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topograph. christ.* lib. xii. (by Gallandi, *Biblioth. Patr.* xi. 572): Οἱ δὲ τὰ Αἰγυπτιακὰ συγγραψάμενοι, τουτίστι Μανιθὼν καὶ Χαιρημῶν καὶ Ἀπολλώνιος ὁ Μολῶν καὶ Λυσίμαχος καὶ Ἀπίων ὁ γραμματικὸς, μέμνηται Μουσίας καὶ τῆς ἐξόδου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ τῆς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου.

The fragments of Lysimachus (both those from Josephus and those of the *Θηβαικὰ παράδοξα* and the *Νόστοι*) are collected in C. Müller, *Fragm. historicorum Graecorum*, iii. 334-342. The fragments of the *Θηβ. παράδ.* are also in Westermann, *Παραδόξογράφοι* (Brunsvigae 1839), p. xxx. sq., 164 sq. Comp. in general: Westermann in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iv. 1311. Stiehle, "Die Nosten des Lysimachos" (*Philologus*, vol. iv. 1849, pp. 99-110; v. 1850, p. 382 sq.). J. G. Müller, *Des Flavii Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion*, p. 208.

4. *Chaeremon* (comp. Josephus, *contra Apion.* i. 32-33). The fragment from Chaeremon also refers to the departure of the Jews from Egypt, and is with respect to its contents nearer to the narrative of Manetho than Lysimachus is. Josephus in this case expressly says, that the fragment was taken from the *Αἰγυπτιακὴ ἱστορία* of Chaeremon (*contra Apion.* i. 32). This Chaeremon is also elsewhere known as an author on Egyptian matters. In the letter of Porphyrius to the Egyptian Anebon, from which Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* iii. 4 and v. 10, gives extracts, two portions which relate to the Egyptian mythology and theology are cited from Chaeremon. In the second (Euseb. v. 10. 5, ed. Gaisford) Porphyrius designates Chaeremon as *ιερογραμματεὺς*. In the work of Porphyrius, which has come down to us, *De abstinentia*, iv. 6-8, a detailed description of the life of Egyptian priests is given from Chaeremon, which Porphyry introduces with the words: "*Chaeremon the Stoic, in treating of the Egyptian priests, who, as he says, are esteemed philosophers among the Egyptians, relates, that they chose the sanctuaries as the place for philosophizing (Τὰ γοῦν κατὰ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἱερέας Χαιρήμων ὁ Στωικὸς ἀφηγούμενος, οὗς καὶ φιλοσόφους ὑπειλήφθαι φησι παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις, ἐξηγεῖται ὡς τόπον μὲν ἐξελέξαντο ἐμφιλοσοφῆσαι τὰ ἱερά).* . . . Despising every other occupation and human pursuit, they devote their whole life to the contemplation of things divine," etc.⁴¹ At the end

⁴¹ The description does not refer to all Egyptian priests, but, as is declared at the conclusion (iv. 8), only to the *élite* among them, the *προφῆται*, *ἱεροστολισταί*, *ιερογραμματεῖς* and *ὠρολόγοι*. Hieronymus, *adv. Jovinian.* ii. 13, borrows the description from Porphyrius (Vallarsi, ii. 342 sq.).

of this account Porphyrius calls Chaeremon a truth-loving, trustworthy and intelligent Stoic philosopher (iv. 8, *fin.*: ἀνδρὸς φιλαλήθους τε καὶ ἀκριβοῦς ἐν τε τοῖς Στωικοῖς πραγματικώτατα φιλοσοφήσαντος). All these portions may well have stood in an "Egyptian History." From it are also derived the communications from Chaeremon in a treatise of Psellus published by Sathas (1877). The same Chaeremon also wrote a work which is taken up in explaining the hieroglyphics (διδάγματα τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων). From this the Byzantine Tzetzes has given extracts in his historical work (v. 403 in Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 499) and in his commentary on the *Iliad* (ed. Gottfr. Hermann, 1812, pp. 123 and 146). Tzetzes also designates Chaeremon as ἱερογραμματεὺς and says, that according to Chaeremon's view "the φυσικὸς λόγος concerning the gods, their physical signification is allegorically exhibited in the hieroglyphics" (Zeller). This also characterizes Chaeremon as a Stoic. Hence there can be no doubt that he is identical with our ἱερογραμματεὺς, who in a few other citations (e.g. in Origen's *contra Celsum*, l. 59. Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 19. 8) is simply called Στωικός. He is on this account a very remarkable personage for his age: an *Egyptian priest and at the same time a Stoic philosopher*. Since he was, according to Suidas, the instructor of Nero (Suidas' *Lex. s.v.* Ἀλέξανδρος Αἰγαῖος), and also the instructor and predecessor of Dionysius of Alexandria, who lived from Nero to Trajan (Suidas' *Lex. s.v.* Διονύσιος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς), he must have lived towards the middle of the first century after Christ. He was, according to Suidas, the predecessor of Dionysius in the office of *librarian at Alexandria*. He cannot, by reason of the chronology stated, be identical with the Chaeremon who is mentioned by Strabo (xvii. 1. 29, p. 806) as a contemporary of Aelius Gallus. Besides the latter has been described as a man, who made himself ridiculous by his ostentation and ignorance, which are certainly not characteristics of a philosopher.

The fragments of Chaeremon are collected in C. Müller, *Frag. hist. graec.* iii. 495-499. To these are to be added: (1) the extracts given in Tzetzes, *Draconis Stratonicensis liber de metris poeticis et Joannis Tzetzae exegesis in Homeri Iliadem*, 1st ed. Godofr. Hermannus, Lips. 1812, pp. 123 and 146; and (2) those in the treatise of Psellus, published by Sathas (*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, vol. i. 1877, pp. 121-133, 194-208, 309-314). Comp. in general: Bähr in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* ii. 298 sq. Birch, "On the lost book of Chaeremon on Hieroglyphics" (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, second series, vol. iii. 1850, pp. 385-396). Bernays, *Theophrastos' Schrift über die Frömmigkeit* (1866), pp. 21 sq., 150 sq. Zeller, "Die Hieroglyphiker Chäremón und Horapollon" (*Hermes*, vol. xi. 1876, pp. 430-433). Nicolai, *Griechische Literaturgesch.* 2nd ed. ii. 559, 561, 677, 690, iii. 383. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), p. 203 sqq.

5. *Apion* (comp. Josephus, *contra Apion.* ii. 1-13). Apion the grammarian, who was distinguished among all the opponents of the Jews for his special malevolence, and was therefore treated with special harshness by Josephus, was a contemporary and fellow-countryman of Chaeremon. His full name was 'Απίων ὁ Πλειστονίκης.⁴² According to Suidas, *Πλειστονίκης* was the name of his father (*Lex. s.v. 'Απίων ὁ Πλειστονίκου*), which he afterwards took as a surname. When Julius Africanus (in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 10. 16, ed. Gaisford; and in Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 120 and 281) and after him the pseudo-Justinian, *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, c. 9, call the name of the father *Ποσειδώνιος*, this is certainly but a corruption of *Πλειστονίκης*. According to Josephus (*contra Apion.* ii. 3), Apion was born in the oasis of Egypt, and hence was not, as he gave himself out to be, a native of Alexandria. He afterwards however received the rights of Alexandrian citizenship (Jos. *l.c.*), and acquired some fame in Alexandria as a grammarian. He taught temporarily in Rome also in the

⁴² Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 101 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 12. 2): 'Απίων τοῖνον ὁ γραμματικὸς ὁ Πλειστονίκης ἱπικληθεὶς. Clem. Rom. *Homil.* iv. 6: 'Απίωνα τὸν Πλειστονίκην ἄνδρα 'Αλεξανδρίαν, γραμματικὸν τῇν ἱπιστάμεν. Plinius, *Hist. Nat.* xxvii. 5. 75: Apion cognominatus Plistonicea. Gellius, *Noct. Att.* v. 14: Apion qui Plistonices appellatus est. *Ibid.* vi. 8: 'Απίων, Graecus homo, qui Πλειστονίκης est appellatus.

time of Tiberius and Claudius (Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* 'Απίων). In the reign of Caligula he travelled through Greece as an itinerant orator delivering lectures on Homer (Seneca, *epist.* 88). It was also under Caligula, that, on the occasion of the sanguinary conflict of the Alexandrians with the Jews, he came to Rome as the ambassador of the former (Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 8. 1). According to Josephus (*contra Apion.* ii. 3), his death was caused by ulcers in the genitals, against which circumcision was of no avail. He is described as having been ridiculously vain. Tiberius called him *cymbalum mundi*. He himself said, without embarrassment, that those to whom he addressed a work became thereby immortal,⁴³ and congratulated Alexandria on having such a citizen as he was (Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 12).

The works of Apion were manifold. The best known seem to have been his works on Homer (*Commentaries and a Dictionary*). We are here only concerned with his Egyptian History (*Αἰγυπτιακά*), which according to Tatian comprised five books, of which Josephus cites the third, Tatian and his successors the fourth, and Gellius the fifth book.⁴⁴ *This Egyptian History evidently contained all those attacks upon the Jews to which the reply of Josephus refers (c. Apion. ii. 1-3).* Josephus says, at the beginning of his discussion, that it was not easy to go through the discourse (τὸν λόγον) of Apion, because he brought forth all in the greatest disorder. But that about three points might be distinguished: (1) the fables

⁴³ Plinius, *Hist. Nat. praef.* § 25: Apion quidam grammaticus (hic quem Tiberius Caesar cymbalum mundi vocabat, cum propriae famae tympanum potius videri posset) immortalitate donari a se scripsit ad quos aliqua conponebat.

⁴⁴ Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 2: Φησὶ γὰρ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν. Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, c. 38 (= Euseb. *Praep. ev.* x. 11. 14): 'Απίων ὁ γραμματικὸς, ἀνὴρ δοκιμώτατος, ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν (πίστε δὲ εἰσὶν αὐτῷ γραφαί) κ.τ.λ. In agreement herewith Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 101 = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 12. 2. Julius Africanus in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 10. 16, and in Syncell. ed. Dindorf, i. 120 and 281. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohortat. ad Graec.* c. 9. Gellius, *Noct. Att.* v. 14: Apion . . . in libro Aegyptiacorum quinto scripsit.

concerning the departure of the Jews from Egypt, (2) the malicious assertions concerning the Alexandrian Jews, and (3) the accusations in respect of worship and legal customs. Of the latter, Josephus says, that they are mixed up with the accusations of the first two categories (*ἐπὶ τοῖς μέμικται*, ii. 1, *fin.*). Thus it appears that a single *λόγος* of Apion, containing all these accusations, and divided by Josephus for the sake of order into three categories, was in question. Josephus, after entering successively into all three categories (*c. Apion.* ii. 2-3 relates to the first, ii. 4-6 to the second, ii. 7-13 to the third), leaves Apion and begins to give a positive delineation of the Mosaic legislation. At its commencement he once more touches incidentally upon Apion, and says of him that he has heaped his indictments all together (ii. 14: *τὴν κατηγορίαν . . . ἀθρόαν . . . ἔταξεν*), in distinction from Apollonius Molon, whose polemic pervades his whole work. There can therefore be no doubt that the polemic of Josephus refers to only *one* work of Apion's, and indeed to only one section of a larger work. This work was, as Josephus expressly says in the beginning of his discussion (ii. 2), the Egyptian History. In it Apion apparently took occasion, in narrating the departure of the Jews from Egypt, to give a hostile description of them, in like manner as Tacitus does in his Histories (*Hist.* v. 1-12). When consequently Clemens Alexandrinus and later Church authors mention a special work of Apion, *κατὰ Ἰουδαίων*, this rests only upon a mistaken inference from the information of Josephus. It is just the silence of Josephus which proves that no such work ever existed. That these Church authors also had no actual acquaintance with it, is made evident by a more accurate comparison of the text. For Clemens Alexandrinus, in the passage where he mentions it, is in fact only copying from Tatian, who on his part is only quoting Apion's Egyptian History. And all subsequent writers, who pretend to know anything of a work of Apion *κατὰ Ἰουδαίων*, obtain their information from either Clement or Josephus.

Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, c. 38 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 11. 14, ed. Gaisford): Μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον Ἀπίων ὁ γραμματικὸς, ἀνὴρ δοκιμώτατος, ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν (πέντε δὲ εἰσὶν αὐτῷ γραφαὶ) πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, φησὶ δὲ οὕτως· Κατίσκαψε τὴν Αὔραρον Ἀμώσιος κατὰ τὸν Ἀργεῖον γενόμενος Ἰναχον, ὡς ἐν τοῖς Χρόνοις ἀνέγραψεν ὁ Μενδήσιος Πτολεμαῖος.

Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 101 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 12. 2, ed. Gaisford): Ἀπίων τοίνυν ὁ γραμματικὸς ὁ Πλειστονίκης ἐπικληθεὶς ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν Αἰγυπτιακῶν ἱστοριῶν, καίτοι φιλασεχθιμῶνως πρὸς Ἑβραίους διακείμενος, ἀπὲρ Αἰγύπτιος τὸ γένος, ὡς καὶ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων συνπάξασθαι βιβλίον, Ἀμώσιος τοῦ Αἰγυπτίων βασιλέως μεμνημένος καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν πράξεων μάρτυρα παρατίθεται Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Μενδήσιον, καὶ τὰ τῆς λήξεως αὐτοῦ ὅδε ἔχει· "Κατίσκαψε δὲ τὴν κ.ε.λ." (here follows verbally the same quotation as in Tatian, whom Clemens had just before expressly quoted).

Julius Africanus in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 10. 16, and in Syncell. ed. Dindorf, i. 120 and 281: Ἀπίων δὲ ὁ Ποσειδωνίου, περιεργότατος γραμματικῶν, ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων βίβλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν φησὶ, κατὰ Ἰναχον Ἀργεὺς βασιλία, Ἀμώσιος Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεύοντος, ἀποστῆναι Ἰουδαίους, ὧν ἡγεῖσθαι Μωσεία.

Pseudo-Justin. *Cohortatio ad Graec.* c. 9: Οὕτω γάρ Πολέμων τε ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν ἱστοριῶν μέμνηται καὶ Ἀππίων ὁ Ποσειδωνίου ἐν τῇ κατὰ Ἰουδαίων βίβλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν ἱστοριῶν, λίγων κατὰ Ἰναχον Ἀργεὺς βασιλία Ἀμώσιδος Αἰγυπτίων βασιλεύοντος ἀποστῆναι Ἰουδαίους, ὧν ἡγεῖσθαι Μωσεία. Καὶ Πτολεμαῖος δὲ ὁ Μενδήσιος, τὰ Αἰγυπτίων ἱστοριῶν, ἀπασὶ τοῦτοις συντρίχει.

The mention of Apion's supposed work κατὰ Ἰουδαίων was first introduced in this connection by means of Clement. But Clement only says that Apion wrote such a work; for the rest he simply quotes, as Tatian does, Apion's Egyptian History as his authority for the statement that Amosis reigned in the time of Inachus. Julius Africanus, on the contrary, now ventures to assert, on the foundation of the passage of Clement, that this statement was found in both the supposed works of Apion, and at the same time drags in Moses also, who is not even spoken of in the passage quoted from Apion. Finally the author of the *Cohortatio* again copies only from Julius Africanus. This latter fact I have, I think, proved in Brieger's *Zeitschrift für Kirchengesch.* ii. (1878) pp. 319-331. Comp. also Donaldson, *History of Christian Literature*, ii. 96 sqq. Harnack, *Texte und Untersuchungen*, vol. i. Nos. 1, 2, 1882, p. 157. Neumann, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1883, p. 582. Renan, *Marc-Aurèle*, 1882, p. 107, note. The dependence of the *Cohortatio* upon the text to which Julius Africanus had access is at any rate indubitable. Hence Gutschmid, starting from the mistaken assumption that the *Cohortatio* was more ancient than Julius Africanus, supposed that both had a common source (*Jahrb. für class. Philologie*,

1860, pp. 703-708). Some moderns also acquiesce in this view, more through faith in Gutschmid than on sufficient grounds. So Völter, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1883, p. 180 sqq. Dräseke, *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* vol. vii. p. 257 sqq.

Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* iii. 9. 4, in enumerating the works of Josephus, says that his work, *Ueber das hohe Alter der Juden* (i.e. *contra Apion.*), was written "against Apion the grammarian," who had then composed a λόγος against the Jews (πρὸς Ἀπίωνα τὸν γραμματικὸν κατὰ Ἰουδαίων τῆνικαδὲ συντάξαντα λόγον). Evidently this is only inferred from Josephus. The same applies also to Hieronymus, *De viris illustr.* c. 13 (*Opp. ed. Vallarsi*, ii. 851): adversum Appionem grammaticum Alexandrinum, qui sub Caligula legatus missus ex parte gentilium contra Philonem etiam librum, vituperationem gentis Judicæ continentem, scripserat. The account of Eusebius, which Jerome, as his custom is, copies, is here only enlarged by the combination that Apion's book was directed *against Philo*. This combination is founded on Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 8. 1. From the Greek translation of Jerome (Sophronius) again arise the statements in Suidas, *Lex. s.v. Ἰώσηπος*. When it is at last said in the *Clementine Homilies*, that Apion wrote πολλὰ βιβλία against the Jews, this statement must of course not be taken seriously.

Comp. on Apion in general: Burigny, "Mémoire sur Apion" (*Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, ancient series, vol. xxxviii. 1777, pp. 171-178). Lehrs, "Quid Apio Homero præstiterit" (*Quæstiones Epicæ*, 1837, pp. 1-34). Cruice, *De Flavii Josephi in auctoribus contra Apionem offerendis fide et auctoritate* (Paris 1844), p. 9. Schliemann, *Die Clementinen* (1844), p. 111 sqq. C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. græc.* iii. 506-516. Volkmann in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* i. 1 (2nd ed.), p. 1243 sq. Creuzer, *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1853, p. 80 sq. Paret, *Des Flavii Josephus Werke übersetzt*, 7 vols. (1856), pp. 741-745. Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 2nd ed. ii. 187-195. Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* 2nd ed. ii. 345-347. J. G. Müller, *Des Fl. Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), pp. 14-17. Lightfoot, art. "Apion" in Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, i. 128-130.

6. The literary opponents of the Jews hitherto mentioned have been here treated of more thoroughly, because the polemic of Josephus is directed chiefly against them. An exhaustive enumeration of all the Greek and Roman authors, who from the beginning of the second century after Christ expressed themselves in a hostile manner against the Jews, would furnish a list of distinguished names. Almost all the

authors who have to speak of the Jews at all do so in a hostile manner. Among pre-Christian *Greek* authors Josephus chiefly names the distinguished historian and philosopher Posidonius as an adversary of the Jews (*c. Apion.* ii. 7). In his great historical work (see on it Div. i. vol. i. § 3) he probably somewhere seized the opportunity of giving a polemical excursus against the Jews, and afterwards many subsequent writers, as Diodorus (xxxiv. 1) and Trogus Pompeius, who comes down to us through the extract of Justin (xxxvi. 2, 3),⁴⁵ drew either directly or indirectly from his much read work. The works too of Nikarchus (Müller, *Fragm.* iii. 335) and Damokritus (Müller, *Fragm.* iv. 377), which are scarcely known by name, were also polemical. Of *Roman* historians, besides Trogus Pompeius already mentioned, prominence must be given to Tacitus, whose description of the Jews (*Hist.* v. 2 sqq.) is dictated by the most profound contempt. The Roman satirists Horace, Juvenal, and Martial have also notably made the Jews the butt of their wit.

2. *Apologetic.*

Jewish Apologetic followed a twofold way of defence, a direct and an indirect one, against the many attacks which Judaism had to undergo. A large portion of the historic and philosophic literature of Hellenistic Judaism is of an indirectly apologetic character; it seeks to show that the Jewish nation need in no respect shrink from a comparison with other nations. But this was not thought enough; the attempt was also sometimes made to refute point after point in a systematic manner the accusations raised against the Jews. Two of such systematically apologetic works are known to us, one (that of Philo) only by a short fragment, the other (that of Josephus) in the complete text. (1) Eusebius gives in the *Praep. evang.* viii. 11

⁴⁵ Comp. on Posidonius as the source of subsequent writers the article of J. G. Müller, *Stud. u. Kritik.* 1849, p. 893 sqq., and his commentary on Joseph. *c. Apion.* (1877) pp. 214 sqq. and 258 sq.

the description of the Essenes from Philo's ἀπολογία ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων. From this however we can form no idea of its whole design. The work of Philo περὶ Ἰουδαίων, mentioned in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 18. 6, is certainly identical with it. (2) The work of Josephus, to be mentioned in this connection, is known to us by the title of *contra Apion*. This title, which did not originate with Josephus himself, gives an erroneous idea of its contents. For it is by no means occupied with Apion alone, but undertakes a comprehensive and systematic defence of the Jewish people against all the accusations raised against them (further particulars, Div. i. vol. i. § 3).

In endeavouring in what follows to give a sketch of *the main substance of the indictment and defence*, we must chiefly restrict ourselves to the material afforded by Josephus, his work being the only one handed down to us, which both contains a survey of the points of accusation and furnishes a view of the method of apologetic demonstration. The *disposition* of the Graeco-Roman world towards the Jews has been already described (Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 291). Here only the actual accusations and the Jewish answer to them will be brought forward.

1. Extensive and learned matter is furnished by Josephus in the first section (i. 1–23) to prove, that *the Jewish nation was not inferior in point of antiquity to other cultured nations*. He says, that to maintain, that it is of recent origin because the Greek historians say nothing of it, is foolish, even if the assumption were correct. For even the silence of all the Greek historians would prove nothing against the early existence of the nation, since the Jews, as dwelling in an inland country, might easily remain unknown to the Greeks. In truth however *the Jewish nation was already known in very ancient times by the best historians of the Egyptians, Phoenicians, Chaldaean* (Manetho, Dios, Menander, Berosus, and others), *nay even by Greek historians themselves*. The zeal which Josephus exhibits, and the large amount of matter he brings forward, show how important this point was in his

eyes. The assertion of modern origin was equivalent to the assertion of historical insignificance. A nation, which had but recently appeared upon the stage of history, had of course also no importance in history. It received its culture from the more ancient nations. But this was to strike at the roots of Jewish honour, and hence the Jewish apologist regarded it as his first duty thoroughly to repel such an insult.⁴⁶

2. While the Greeks in general were satisfied with denying the high antiquity of the Jewish nation, the Alexandrians related very unfair things concerning the *origin of the Jews*. The quintessence of their fictions was, that the Jews were leprous Egyptians, who succeeded in a very dishonourable manner in forming themselves into a separate nation, in leaving Egypt and settling in Palestine.⁴⁷ Josephus felt himself master of the situation in opposing these fables. With dignified superiority he pointed out to the Alexandrians the absurdity and the internal discrepancy of their assertions (i. 24-35, ii. 1-3).

3. With the imputation of recentness of origin was connected the assertion, that the Jews had *done nothing for culture*. Apollonius Molon said, that they were the most incapable of barbarians and had therefore contributed no useful invention to general culture (*contra Apion*. ii. 14: ἀφνεστάτους εἶναι τῶν βαρβάρων καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μηδὲν εἰς τὸν βίον εὖρημα συμβεβλησθαι μόνους). Apion said, that they had produced no eminent men, such as inventors of arts or men distinguished for wisdom (*contra Apion*. ii. 12: θαυμαστοὺς ἄνδρας οὐ παροσχέκαμεν, οὐκ τεχνῶν τινῶν εὐρετὰς ἢ σοφίᾳ διαφέροντας). These reproaches were encountered with the older Jewish

⁴⁶ On the motive for the proof of antiquity, see *contra Apion*. ii. 15. It is well known, that Christian apologists also lay great stress upon it. See Tatian, c. xxxi. 36-41. Theophilus, *ad Autol.* iii. 20 sqq. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* i. 21. 101-147. Tertullian, *Apolog.* 19. Pseudo-Justin, *Cohort. ad Graec.* c. 9. Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* x. 9 sqq. And more in Semisch, *Justin*, i. 134.

⁴⁷ So with much variation of detail: Manetho (*contra Apion*. i. 26), Iysimachus (i. 34), Chäremon (i. 32), Apion (ii. 2). Also Justin, xxxvi. 2, and Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 8. Comp. also Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 250.

legend, that *the Jews were on the contrary the originators of all culture*. According to Eupolemus, Moses was the first sage, the inventor of alphabetic writing (see above, p. 203). According to Artapanus, Abraham instructed the Egyptians in astrology, Joseph undertook the improved cultivation of the land, and Moses introduced culture of every kind (p. 206). The philosopher Aristobulus already declares Moses to be the father of Greek philosophy, and that Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and the rest all derived their philosophy from him (p. 240 sq.). The same assertion is repeated by Philo, and Josephus takes just the same tone though making no use in his Apology of the legends of Eupolemus and Artapanus. He lays the chief stress upon proving besides the high antiquity, the wisdom and excellence of the Mosaic legislation.

4. The special accusations against Judaism were above all in respect of its *religious worship*, which was always connected with the refusal to acknowledge any other worship as legitimate. This last was in the era of heathenism a thing unheard of. "To live and let live" was the motto in the province of religion. The most opposite kinds of religious worship were readily tolerated, if only the adherents of one cultus would hold others legitimate. Especially was it taken for granted as a thing self-evident, that the citizens of the same town should, besides any private worship of their own, participate in honouring the gods of the town. What an abnormality then must it have been felt, that the Jews should entirely reject every kind of worship except their own, and absolutely refuse to take part in any other! From the standpoint of Hellenism this was *synonymous with Atheism*. If they are citizens, why do they not worship the gods of the city? This accusation of *ἀθεϊσμός*, of contempt for the gods, recurs in almost all adversaries of the Jews, from Apollonius Molon and Posidonius to Pliny and Tacitus;⁴⁸ and from it

⁴⁸ Apion in Joseph. *contra Apion*. ii. 6: quomodo ergo, inquit, si sunt cives, eosdem deos, quos Alexandrini, non colunt? Posidonius and Apollonius Molon, *ibid.* ii. 7: accusant quidem nos, quare nos eosdem deos

certainly arose in great part the conflicts of municipalities with the Jews, especially in the towns where they possessed rights of citizenship. It was easy in theory but difficult in practice, for apologetic to hold its ground in presence of this accusation. With an educated reader it was not very difficult to make manifest the advantages of the monotheistic and spiritual view of the nature of God, especially as Greek philosophy offered an abundance of thoughts, which came in this respect to the aid of Jewish apologists. In this sense does Josephus proceed, simply exhibiting the Jewish idea of God in its superiority (*contra Apion*. ii. 22). In practice however the masses were not to be influenced by such considerations. For the reproach still adhered to the Jews, that they absolutely rejected what others regarded as the worship of God. Hence the chief weapon of Jewish apologetic upon this point was a vigorous attack. When the Jews were reproached for despising the gods, they showed on their part what kind of gods they were, whom others honoured; weak images of wood, stone, silver, or gold, the work of men's hands, or animals of every kind, or at best beings, who were affected with manifold human weaknesses. The Jews might well feel themselves superior to the worshippers of such gods (comp. *e.g.* pseudo-Aristeas in Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 116. *Sap. Salomonis*, c. 13–15. *The Epistle of Jeremiah*, Joseph. *contra Apion*. ii. 33–35, and especially the *Sibyllines*).

Of less practical importance than the charge of ἀθεΐα were certain ridiculous fables which were related concerning the Jewish worship; that they paid divine honours to an *ass's head*, and that they annually *sacrificed a Greek* and fed upon his entrails (see above, § 31, notes 239, 240, 250). Such fables were indeed believed only in small circles, and Josephus very easily proves their absurdity (*contra Apion*. ii. 7–9).

5. Of greater weight, on the other hand, was another

cum aliis non colimus. Apollonius Molon, *ibid.* ii. 14: ὅς αἰθερός . . . λαϊδορεῖ. Plinius, *H. N.* xiii. 4. 46: gens contumelia numinum insignia. Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5: contemnere deos.

point connected with the *θεῖος* of the Jews, viz. their refusal of *the worship of the emperor*. Subsequently to Augustus all the provinces emulated each other in the practice of this cult (see Div. ii. vol. i. p. 16 sq.). Zeal for this was the standard of a loyal and Rome-loving disposition, its entire rejection was synonymous with not showing due respect to the authorities. Such was at least the view of the Hellenistic population, who, according to the customs of the Hellenistic period, freely offered their worship to the emperor. The Jews were in a favourable position in this respect, inasmuch as the emperors of the first centuries, with the sole exception of Caligula, did not directly demand this worship. Nor, apart from the short episode under Caligula, was it ever required of the Jews, whose mode of worship received legal protection, together with the legal recognition of their communities from Caesar onwards (see above, Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 265). For the adversaries of the Jews, however, it was always a welcome point of attack, that they proved themselves bad citizens by their refusal of worship to the emperor.⁴⁹ Jewish apologists could, in answer to this charge, appeal to the fact, that a sacrifice was daily offered for the emperor in the temple at Jerusalem (Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 6, *fin.*; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 10. 4; comp. Div. ii. vol. i. p. 302), and that on special occasions even hecatombs were offered for the Roman emperor (Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* § 45, Mang. ii. 598). Thus, in fact, was a certain equivalent furnished for that worship of the emperor which was impossible to Jews. Josephus, besides, does not neglect pointing on every occasion to the favour which the Jews enjoyed both from the Ptolemies and from Caesar (*c. Apion.* ii. 4, 5; *Antt.* xiv. 10, xvi. 6). This surely would have been impossible unless they had been loyal citizens!

6. With this religious isolation was connected a certain amount of *social isolation*. Judaism expressly repudiated the

⁴⁹ Apion in Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 6, *med.*: *derogare nobis Apion voluit, quia imperatorum non statuamus imagines. Tacitus, Hist. v. 5: non regibus haec adulatio, non Caesaribus honor.*

idea, now more and more making its way in Hellenism, that all men are brethren, and therefore equal before God. It saw in the unbeliever only the sinner, who has incurred the judgment of God, and referred the fatherly love of God only to the seed of Abraham, on which account only the children of Abraham are brethren to each other. If this particularism was not held in its full rigour by philosophic and Hellenistic Judaism in general, it gained on the other hand a support from the view, that the heathen as such were unclean, that in the interest of Levitical purity intercourse with them was as far as possible to be avoided, and from the anxiety with which contact with everything that stood in any kind of relation to idolatry was abhorred (comp. Div. ii. vol. i. pp. 51–56). *If, then, the Jew was already directed in theory to regard the non-Jew as only an "alien," it was also impossible to him in practice, if he desired to observe the law, to live in any close social intercourse with the heathen.* This theoretical and practical *ἀμείξια*, which was in opposition to the entire tendency of the Hellenistic period, was constantly and very specially made a reproach against the Jews. To the Greeks and Romans, who were unacquainted with its deeper motives, it appeared only as a want of humanity, of true philanthropy, nay as criminal misanthropy. And it may indeed not infrequently have really manifested itself in such forms.⁶⁰ The process adopted in this respect by apologetic writers was on the one hand chiefly that

⁶⁰ The councillors of Antiochus Sidetes already pointed to the *ἀμείξια* of the Jews (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 8. 8, and Diodor. xxxiv. 1, probably after Posidonius). Justinus, xxxvi. 2. 15: caverunt, ne cum peregrinis conviverent. Apollonius Molon in Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 14: ὡς . . . μισανθρώπους λαιδοροῖ. *Ibid.* ii. 36: ὁ Μόλων Ἀπολλώνιος ἡμῶν κατηγορεῖται ὅτι μὴ παραδεχόμεθα τοὺς ἄλλοις προκαταλειγμένους δόξαις περὶ τοῦ, μηδὲ κοινωνεῖν ἐθέλομεν τοῖς καθ' ἑτέραν συνήθειαν βίου ζῆν προαιρουμένοις. Lysimachus asserted (Joseph. *c. Apion.* i. 84), that Moses had directed the Jews: μήτε ἀνθρώπων τιπὶ ἐνόησιν, etc. According to Apion (Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 8), the Jews were accustomed, at the annual sacrifice of a Greek, to swear, ut inimicitias contra Graecos haberent, or, as it is said, ii. 10: μὴδὲ ἐνόησιν ἄλλοφύλῃ μάλιστα δι' Ἕλλησιν Tacit. *Hist.* v. 5: adversus omnes alios hostile odium: separati epulis, discreti cubilibus . . . alienarum concubita abstinent. Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 103–104 (see Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 295).

of pointing to the humane appointments of the law, especially with regard to strangers (Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 28–29), and on the other that of showing, how the ancient laws of other States went much farther in the exclusion of strangers than the Mosaic law did (*c. Apion.* ii. 36–37).

7. The peculiarities of the Jews *already mentioned*, viz. their ἀθεόρως and their ἀμυξία, are those which *came forward the most prominently in public life*. It was on this account that the Jews appeared to be the enemies of such public regulations and institutions as had then been formed, nay as the opponents of all other human intercourse. Hence it is on these points that attacks are most seriously directed. Other peculiarities gave occasion rather to derision and contempt than to actual accusations. Among these were (a) *circumcision*, (b) *abstinence from swine's flesh*, and (c) *the observance of the Sabbath*.⁵¹ Even the most malicious of their other opponents did not venture upon the reproach of that special immorality to which Tacitus alludes.⁵² Apologetic writers oppose to the derision shown towards these several peculiarities an *ideal picture of the entire Mosaic code*. As Philo by his idealistic representation of the Mosaic legislation (see above, p. 219 sq.) already gave an indirect apology for it, so also does Josephus endeavour, by a connected and positive statement, to show, that the precepts of the Mosaic law are in every respect the purest and most ideal (*c. Apion.* ii. 22–30). In doing this he does not enter into these objectionable points, but contents himself with referring his opponent, the Egyptian Apion, to the fact, that the Egyptian priests also were circumcised and abstained from swine's flesh (*Ap.* ii. 13). To show the value and excellency of the law, he points out in general its high antiquity (ii. 15), the blameless character of

⁵¹ *Circumcision*: Apion in Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 13, *init.* Horace, *Sat.* i. 9. 69 sq. *Swine's flesh*: Apion in Joseph. *c. Apion.* ii. 13, *init.* Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 160, xiv. 98. *Observance of the Sabbath*: Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 105–106. Tacit. *Hist.* v. 4.

⁵² Tacit. *Hist.* v. 5: projectissima ad libidinem gens . . . inter se nihil illicitum.

Moses the lawgiver, and also the fact that this law really fulfilled its object, being known and obeyed by all, which astonishing result arose from its being not only taught but practised (ii. 16-19). Finally, Josephus brings forward the circumstance, that no Jew is ever unfaithful to his law, which is again a proof of its excellence (ii. 31-32, 38). The deficiencies found in this treatise, inasmuch as it does not further enter into those points which were objected to by the heathen, are abundantly compensated for by Philo, who in his special delineation of the Mosaic law treats all these points very thoroughly, and everywhere proves their reasonableness.⁵³

VII. JEWISH PROPAGANDA UNDER A HEATHEN MASK.

At the close of our survey, we have still to discuss a class of literary productions highly characteristic of Hellenistic Judaism, viz. *Jewish works under a heathen mask*. The works which belong to this category, differ greatly so far as their literary form is concerned, but have all the common feature of appearing under the name of some heathen authority, whether of a mythological authority, as the sibyl, or of persons eminent in history, as Hecataeus and Aristaeus. The very choice of this pseudonymic form shows, that *all these works were calculated for heathen readers, and designed for the propagation of Judaism among the heathen*. For only with heathen readers were such names a standard authority, and only on their account could this form have been chosen by Jewish authors. Hence the tendency, which is peculiar to a large portion of the Graeco-Jewish literature in general, viz. the tendency to influence non-Jewish readers, here obtains significant expression. In one respect or another its intention was to carry on

⁵³ On *Circumcision*: *de circumcissione* = *Opp.* ed. Mang. ii. 210-212. *Sabbath observance*: *de septenario*, § 6-7 = Mang. ii. 281-284. *Prohibition of unclean animals*: *de concupiscentia*, § 4-9 = Mang. ii. 352-355. On the observance of the Sabbath, compare also Aristobulus in Euseb. *Præp. evang.* xiii. 12. 9-16, on unclean animals, pseudo-Aristaeus in Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 117.

among the heathen a propaganda for Judaism. The special design however certainly differed in different cases. The Sibyllines desire to effect a propaganda properly so called. They set forth directly before the heathen world the folly of idolatry and the depravity of its moral conduct; they threaten punishment and ruin in case of impenitence, and promise reward and eternal happiness in case of conversion, and they thus seek to win adherents to the Jewish faith in the midst of the heathen world. An effect however of quite a different kind is aimed at in other works of this category; their purpose is not so much to propagate the faith as the honour and credit of the Jews. Thus, pseudo-Aristeas *e.g.* seeks, in his whole narrative of the translation of the Jewish law into Greek, to show what a high opinion was entertained by the learned Ptolemy II. of this law and of Jewish wisdom in general, and with what great honour he treated Jewish scholars. A directly missionary purpose does not come forward in this author; he cares more to *create a favourable disposition* towards Judaism and the Jewish law. And thus throughout this category, now one, now the other purpose comes more into the foreground—at one time that of winning believers, at another, that of creating a favourable impression. Still in one way or the other and in the wider meaning all subserve the propagation of Judaism. And since they all make choice of a heathen mask for this purpose, they all belong, however much they may differ otherwise in form and contents, to one category.

We begin our discussion with the Sibylline oracles, not because these are the oldest works of this class, but because they are the most important both with respect to extent and actual effect.

1. *The Sibyllines.*

The sibyl was in heathen antiquity “the semi-divine prophetess of the orders and counsels of the gods concerning

the fate of cities and kingdoms" (Lücke).⁵⁴ She was distinguished from the official priestly order of prophets by representing a free and non-official prophetic power, being indeed first of all a personification of the Deity as revealing itself in nature. She is represented as a nymph dwelling by streams and grottoes. The most ancient authors speak only of a sibyl; so Heraclitus, who is the first to mention one at all (in Plutarch, *de Pythiae oraculis*, c. 6); so also Euripides, Aristophanes, Plato.⁵⁵ The fact, that her voice was said to have been perceived in different places, then led to the supposition, that she wandered from place to place.⁵⁶ At last this was not found sufficient, and different sibyls said to dwell in different places were distinguished. Their number is very differently stated. There are learned combinations, which have been made now in one manner, now in another.⁵⁷ The statement of Pausanias (*Descr. Graec.* x. 12), who distinguishes four sibyls, is worthy of notice. These are: (1) The Herophile who came from Marpessus in the region of Troy, prophesied in various parts of Asia Minor and Greece and was falsely stated by the Erythraeans to have been an Erythraean; (2) a more ancient one, probably the Libyan (Maass, p. 7), but whose abode, in consequence of a gap in the text of Pausanias, cannot be determined; (3) the Cumanian; and (4) the Hebrew, who is also called the Babylonian or Egyptian.

⁵⁴ The most important material concerning the sibyls was already collected by Opsopöus in his edition of the *Orac. Sibyll.* pp. 56-143. For more recent authorities, comp. especially: Klausen, *Aeneas und die Penaten* (1839), pp. 203-312. Lücke, *Einleitung in die Offenbarung des Johannes* (2nd ed.), p. 81 sqq. Alexandre in his 1st ed. vol. ii. (1856) pp. 1-101. Scheffele, art. "Sibyllae," in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* vi. 1147-1153. Pape-Benseler, *Wörterb. der griech. Eigennamen*, s.v. Σίβυλλα. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. iii. (1878) p. 336 sqq. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination*, vol. ii.; *Les sacerdocees divinatoires; devins, chresmologues, Sibylles; Oracles des dieux*, Paris 1879. Maass, *De Sibyllarum indicibus*, Diss. Gryphiswald 1879.

⁵⁵ Maass, *De Sibyllarum indicibus*, p. 1.

⁵⁶ E.g. Pausanias, *Descr. Graec.* x. 12.

⁵⁷ On the numerous calculations, see especially Maass, *De Sibyllarum indicibus*, 1879.

It seems as if Pausanias purposed thus to state the four chief kinds of sibyl: the Libyan as the most ancient, that of Greek, Asia Minor, the Roman and the Oriental. He expressly designates the latter as the most recent. It is highly probable, that the information relating to this subject is already a deposite of the Jewish sibyl fiction.⁵⁸ Among other computations, the most noted is that of Varro, who names ten sibyls.⁵⁹ In the Roman period the most famous were the Erythraean (from Erythraea on the Ionian coast, opposite the island of Chios) and the Cumanian (in Lower Italy).

Written records of supposed Sibylline oracles were here and there in circulation; but such remains of them as have come down to us through occasional quotations in authors such as Plutarch, Pausanias and others, are brief and scanty, and furnish no distinct notion of them.⁶⁰ In Asia Minor

⁵⁸ The words of Pausanias are as follows (*Descr. Graec.* x. 12. 9): 'Ἐκτράφη δὲ καὶ ὕστερον τῆς Δημοῦς [but there lived later than Demo] παρὰ Ἑβραίοις τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς Παλαιστίνης γυνὴ χρησμολόγος, ὄνομα δὲ αὐτῇ Σάββη. Βηρώσου δὲ εἶναι πατὴρ καὶ Ἑρμῶνθης μητὴρ φασὶ Σάββην· οἱ δὲ αὐτὴν Βαβυλωνίαν, ἑτέροι δὲ Σίβυλλαν καλοῦσιν Αἰγυπτίαν. — Alexander Polyhistor being the first among Greek authors known to us, who quotes the Jewish sibyl (see below), we may perhaps conclude, that Pausanias derived his statements from Alexander (see Maass, pp. 12-22). From a similar source come also the statements concerning Σαμβήθη in Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Σίβυλλα (Σίβυλλα Χαλδαία ἢ καὶ πρὸς τινῶν Ἑβραίων ὀνομαζομένη, ἢ καὶ Περσίς, ἢ κυρίῳ ὀνόματι καλουμένη Σαμβήθη κ.τ.λ.), and in the anonymous catalogues allied to Suidas, which mention Σαμβήθη (Maass, *De Sibyll. indic.* pp. 38, 42, 44). The designation of the sibyl as a daughter of Berossus is found also in pseudo-Justin, *Cohort. ad Graec.* c. 37. The Jewish sibyl identifies herself with the Erythraean, but says that she came from Babylon (*Sib.* iii. 808 sqq.). Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* vi. 70-71, calls her προφήτις Ἑβραίων. Comp. in general, Alexandre, ii. 82-87.

⁵⁹ Varro in Lactantius, *Div. Instit.* i. 6: primam fuisse de Persis . . . secundam Libycam . . . tertiam Delphida . . . quartam Cimmeriam in Italia . . . quintam Erythraeam . . . sextam Samiam . . . septimam Cumanam . . . octavam Hellesponticam in agro Troiano natam vico Marmesso circa oppidum Gergitium . . . nonam Phrygiam . . . decimam Tiburtem. See other computations, e.g. in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 21. 108 and 132; Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Σίβυλλα and others.

⁶⁰ See the collection in Alexandre's 1st ed. of the *Orac. Sibyll.* vol. ii. (1856) pp. 118-129. Some already in Opsopöus, in his edit. of the *Orac. Sibyll.* p. 414 sqq.

and Greece these pieces circulated only in private possession, without being publicly supervised or officially used. But their credit and influence must not be on that account slightly estimated.⁶¹ They attained quite a different importance in Rome, where they arrived by way of Cumae from Asia Minor.⁶² King Tarquin Superbus is said to have obtained a collection of Sibylline oracles, which were preserved in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.⁶³ These having perished in the conflagration of the Capitol, B.C. 83, the Senate, at the instigation of the consul C. Curio, sent an embassy, B.C. 76, to Asia Minor, which again made in Erythraea and other places a collection of about a thousand verses, which was again deposited in the Capitol.⁶⁴ The collection was afterwards occasionally enlarged and expurgated, and was in existence in the fourth century after Christ. Besides this official collection, Sibylline verses in private possession were also circulated, but these, by reason of the misuse made of them, were frequently confiscated and destroyed by the authorities. The official collection was kept secret, and only consulted on important occasions, chiefly to ascertain what expiations were required on the occurrence of public misfortunes.

This Sibyllism was from its very nature specially adapted for being turned to account in the interest of religious propaganda. The oracles, being of apocryphal origin, in private possession, and circulating without control, might be completed and added to at pleasure. What had been done in this respect by Greek hands might as easily be undertaken by Jewish. Besides the oracles, like the mysterious in general,

⁶¹ See on the Sibylline oracles among the Greeks, Alexandre as above, ii. 102-147.

⁶² See on the Sibylline oracles among the Romans, Opsopöus, pp. 462-496. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* i. 248-257. Alexandre in his 1st ed. ii. 148-253. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. iii. (1878) p. 336 sqq. Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome* (New York 1876), pp. 395-459.

⁶³ Dionys. Halicarn. iv. 62.

⁶⁴ Lactant. i. 6. 14 (comp. i. 6. 11). Tacit. *Annal.* vi. 12. Dionys. Halic. iv. 62.

enjoyed a high reputation among religiously disposed minds. It might then be hoped that entrance to extensive circles would be obtained under this form. Hence it was a happy hit when *Jewish propaganda took possession of this form to turn it to account for its own purposes*. As far as can be ascertained, it was in the second century before Christ that an extensive Sibylline oracle of Jewish origin was first put in circulation from Alexandria. The result seems to have been favourable, for imitators soon arose, at first among the Jews and subsequently among the Christians. For Christians were in this respect also the apt scholars of Hellenistic Judaism. They not only made willing use of the Jewish Sibylline oracles, and highly esteemed them, but also copiously increased what they found extant. Production in this department continued down to later imperial times, and it is just to the tradition of the Christian Church that we are indebted for the possession of the older Jewish Sibylline oracles also.

The first edition of the Judaeo-Christian Sibyllines (Basle 1545) which have come down to us was prepared by Xystus Betuleius after an Augsburg, now a Munich manuscript, and comprised *eight books*. The later editions show the same number down to and including that printed in Gallandi's *Bibliotheca patrum* (vol. i. Venice 1788). Angelo Mai was the first to publish from a Milan manuscript a *fourteenth* book (1817), and afterwards from two Vatican manuscript books *eleven to fourteen* (1828). All are combined in the modern editions of Alexandre (1st ed. in 2 vols. 1841–1856, 2nd ed. 1 vol. 1869) and Friedlieb (1852).

The form of these Judaeo-Christian Sibylline oracles is the same as that of the ancient heathen ones. The Jewish and Christian authors respectively make the ancient Sibyl speak to heathen nations in Greek hexameters, and in the language of Homer. The contents subserve throughout the purposes of religious propaganda. The Sibyl prophesies the fate of the world from the beginning to the times of the author, for the purpose of then uniting with it both threats and promises for

the immediate future ; she rebukes the heathen nations for the sinfulness of their idolatry and blasphemy, and exhorts them to repent while yet there is time, for that fearful judgments will fall upon the impenitent.

The collection *as we have it is a chaotic wilderness*, to sift and arrange which will ever baffle the most acute criticism. For unfortunately it is not the case, that each book forms of itself an original whole, but that even the single books are some of them arbitrary aggregates of single fragments. The curse of pseudonymous authorship seems to have prevailed very specially over these oracles. Every reader and writer allowed himself to complete what existed after his own pleasure, and to arrange the scattered papers now in one, now in an opposite manner. Evidently much was at first circulated in detached portions, and the collection of these afterwards made by some admirer was a very accidental one. Hence duplicates of many portions are found in different places. And the manuscripts which have come down to us exhibit great discrepancies in the arrangement.^{64a}

Such being the nature of the whole, it is not possible always to distinguish with certainty between *Jewish* and *Christian* matter. The oldest portions are at all events Jewish, worked up perhaps with single small heathen oracles. The main body of the later books is certainly Christian. But neither the one nor the other appears in large and closely connected masses. As a rule we have always but small portions quite loosely strung together, and often without any connection. Hence it is only with respect to single and comparatively small portions that we can pass a certain judgment, as to whether they are Jewish or Christian. Much is of so neutral a character, that it may just as well have proceeded from one side as from the other. *The following portions may with some probability be distinguished as Jewish.*

^{64a} The preface of the compiler of our present collection is still preserved (Friedlieb, Appendix, pp. ii.-vii. Alexandre's 1st ed. i. 2-13, 2nd ed. pp. 14-21). Alexandre thinks he can place it in the sixth century after Christ (1st ed. ii. 421-435, 2nd ed. p. xxxvi. sqq.).

1. The most ancient and certainly Jewish portions are in any case contained in the *third book*. All critics since Bleek concur in this opinion. Views, however, differ widely as to any nearer determination, whether of the date of composition or of the extent of the Jewish portions. According to Bleek, Book iii. 97–807 (according to another computation, iii. 35–746) is the work of an Alexandrian Jew of the time of the Maccabees (170–160 B.C.), and contains also a working up of older Jewish fictions (97–161, 433–488 [= 35–99, 371–426]), and later Christian interpolations (350–380 [= 289–318]). The majority of Bleek's successors regard the whole as Jewish. Gfrörer, Lücke, and Friedlieb concur with Bleek with regard to the date of composition. Hilgenfeld, on the ground of an ingenious exposition of the difficult section iii. 388–400, places the whole (iii. 97–817) about 140 B.C., and is followed herein by Reuss, Badt, and Wittichen. Zündel also accepted his exposition of iii. 388–400, but kept to Bleek's view of the earlier date of composition. Ewald went a little farther forward than Hilgenfeld, by placing the composition of Book iii. 97–828 at about 124 B.C. But while all hitherto mentioned agree in assuming a Jewish authorship, Alexandre ascribes only the portions iii. 97–294, 489–817, to an Alexandrian Jew of about 168 B.C., and the intermediate portion, 295–488, on the contrary to a Christian writer. Larocque, while going still farther in the division, agrees with Alexandre in regarding the bulk of Book iii. 97–294, 489–828 as written about 168 B.C., but admits also later interpolations in the last section, and considers the sections iii. 1–96 and 295–488 as "subordinate collections of heterogeneous pieces," of which only certain individual portions belong to the author of the two first-named large portions. Delaunay also esteems the portions iii. 97–294 and 489–817 not as single productions, but as aggregates of separate unconnected oracles of different periods, ranging from about the beginning to the middle of the second century B.C.

For the purpose of forming a judgment we will first give

a survey of the contents, with the omission of the section iii. 1-96, which certainly does not belong to what follows. The rest is clearly divided by means of the recent additions in vers. 295 and 498 into three groups (97-294, 295-488, 489-828). The beginning of the *first group* is wanting. It commences abruptly by recalling the building of the Tower of Babel and the Confusion of Tongues as the causes of the dispersion of mankind in all lands (97-100). When the whole earth was peopled, the sovereignty over it was divided between Chronos, Titan, and Japetos. All three at first ruled peacefully near each other, but a quarrel arose between Chronos and Titan, which was only settled for a time by an assembly of the gods (or as the Jewish author expresses it, by an assembly of the βασιλεῖς), and resulted in the contest between the Chronides and Titans, and the destruction of both these races. After their annihilation arose successively the kingdoms of the Egyptians, Persians, Medes, Ethiopians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Macedonians, then again of the Egyptians, and lastly of the Romans (110-161). Now first does the Sibyl begin to prophesy; in the first place the prosperity of the Solomonian kingdom, then the Graeco-Macedonian, lastly the many-headed (πολύκρανος) kingdom of the Romans. After the seventh king of Egypt of the Hellenic race, the people of God again attain to sovereignty and will be to all mortals a leader of life (162-195). The judgment of God will fall upon all the kingdoms of the world, from the Titans and Chronides onwards. Even the pious men of Solomon's kingdom will be visited by misfortune. Here the author takes occasion to give a sketch of the Jewish people, their reverence for God, and the main points of their history from their departure from Egypt down to Cyrus (196-294). The *second group* is almost entirely taken up with announcements of judgments and calamities: Against Babylon (295-313), against Egypt (314-318), against Gog and Magog (319-322), against Libya (323-333). After the signs which forebode calamity have been stated, there

follow proclamations of woe to single towns and countries, concluding with the promise of a universal condition of Messianic prosperity and peace in Asia and Europe (341-380). Then follow oracles concerning Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors (381-400), concerning Phrygia, Troy (interspersed with polemic against Homer), Lycia, Cyprus, Italy, and other countries, towns and islands (401-488). The *third group* begins with oracles concerning Phoenicia, Crete, Thrace, Gog and Magog, the Hellenes (489-572); it then points to the people of Israel, who cleave to the law of God, and do not devote themselves to idolatry and unnatural crimes (573-600). Hereupon follows a second prophecy of judgment upon the sinful world terminating in promises (601-623), and an exhortation to conversion, with a description of the ruin which will come upon the ungodly world, and especially upon Hellas (624-651). The promise of the Messianic King, a prophecy of judgment, and a detailed description of Messianic prosperity, interspersed with exhortations to Hellas to cease from their presumption, and references to omens of the last judgment, form the conclusion (652-807). The Sibyl says in the epilogue, that she came from Babylon, but was wrongly regarded by the Greeks as a native of Erythraea (808-817), also that she was a daughter of Noah, and had been with him in the ark at the time of the Deluge (818-828).⁶⁵

This survey of the contents shows, that in any case we have not to deal with a single composition. In the second group especially, the different portions are entirely unconnected with each other. Hence it is in any case *a collection of separate oracles*. Nevertheless it is at least possible, that the greater number of them are the work of one author. For there is not sufficient support for accepting either a heathen

⁶⁵ Bleek denies the authorship of the whole epilogue to the composer of the rest. With respect to the first half (808-817) there is no valid ground for such denial. It might rather be doubted whether the first and second halves belong to each other. See Hilgenfeld, *Apokal.* pp. 78-80.

or a Christian origin of the pieces. The mythological portion at the beginning, which kindly makes the heathen gods guiltless human kings of antiquity, may very well have been written by a Jew, nay this kind of intermixture of Greek and Jewish legends just corresponds with the character of Hellenistic Judaism. There exists however no reason for supposing that it contains Christian elements, since instead of *νῶν θεοῖο* in ver. 775 the correct reading is probably *νηὸν θεοῖο* (see vol. ii. p. 139). The circumstance that the time of the seventh Ptolemy is referred to in all three groups (vers. 191–193, 316–318, 608–610) speaks for their virtual connection. Hence the inference attained with respect to the date of composition of the separate portions may with a certain amount of probability be extended to the whole.

For determining the *date of composition*, the following limits exist. The author is acquainted with the Book of Daniel (vers. 388–400), and the expeditions of Antiochus Epiphanes to Egypt (vers. 611–615). On the other hand Rome is still a republic (ver. 176: *πολύκρανος*). But the most accurate limit is furnished by the threefold recurrence of the assurance, that the end will appear under the seventh king of Egypt of Hellenic race (vers. 191–193, 316–318, 608–610). Hence the author wrote under Ptolemy VII. Physcon, who at first reigned together with his brother Ptolemy VI. Philometor (170–164 B.C.), was then banished from Egypt, but attained after his brother's death to the sole sovereignty (145–117 B.C.). When Zundel thinks, that because the king is called *βασιλεὺς νέος* (ver. 608), only the years from 170–164 B.C. can be thought of, since Ptolemy Physcon could by no means be any longer called young after the year 145, it must be answered, that *νέος* means not only "young," but "new." The proper sovereignty however of Ptolemy Physcon did not begin till the year 145. And that the author intended just this period of sole sovereignty is already in and by itself probable; for he would have designated the joint government of the two

brothers as the sixth kingship. This too is confirmed by the plain allusions to the destruction of Carthage and Corinth (vers. 484 sq., 487 sq.), both which cities were, as is well known, destroyed in the year 146 before Christ. The section vers. 388—400 also leads, according to the ingenious, but not indeed quite certain explanation of Hilgenfeld, to the same period (*Apokalyptik*, p. 69 sq.; *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 314 sqq., 1871, p. 35). Here Antiochus Epiphanes is first referred to, and his overthrow then prophesied: "He will himself destroy their race, through whose race his race also will be destroyed. He has a single root, which also the man-slayer (Ares) will eradicate out of ten horns. But he will plant another shoot beside it. He will eradicate the warlike progenitor of a royal race. And he himself is exterminated by the sons. And then will a horn planted near rule."⁶⁶ The race which Antiochus Epiphanes will destroy is that of his brother Seleucus IV. The sole root of Antiochus Epiphanes, viz. his son Antiochus V. Eupator, is murdered by Demetrius I., son of Seleucus IV., or, as the author expresses it, he is eradicated out of ten horns, i.e. as the last of ten kings. The shoot, which the god of war plants near, is Alexander Balas. He will exterminate the warlike progenitor of a royal race, viz. Demetrius I. But he will be himself destroyed by Demetrius II. and Antiochus VII. Sidetes, sons of Balas. And then will the upstart Trypho rule (146—139 B.C.). According to this explanation of Hilgenfeld, our author would have written about 140 B.C. And to this we must in any case adhere, even if the details of the explanation should not be all correct.⁶⁷ Traces of a later time can

⁶⁶ Vers. 394—400: "Ὁν δὴ περ γενεὴν αὐτὸς θέλει ἐξαπολίσσαι,
'Εκ τῶν δὴ γενεῆς κείνου γένος ἐξαπολείται·
'Ρίζαν ἰαν γε διδοῦς, ἣν καὶ κόψει βροτολογιῶς
'Εκ δίκᾳ δὴ κεράτων, παρὰ δὲ φυτὸν ἄλλο φυτεῖται.
Κόψει πορφυρέης γενεῆς γενετῆρα μαχητῆν,
Καὐτὸς αὖ υἱὸν, ὃν ἐς ὀμόφρονα αἰσιον ἄβρης,
Φθείται· καὶ τότε δὴ παραφύομενον κίρως ἀρξεῖται.

The words ὃν ἐς ὀμόφρονα αἰσιον ἄβρης are certainly corrupt.

⁶⁷ Two things only are suspicious: (1) The subject of κόψει, ver. 398,

scarcely be found. For the western nation, which according to vers. 324, 328 sq. is to take part in the destruction of the temple, is not the Roman, but according to Ezek. xxxviii. 5 the Libyan (so Lücke, Hilgenfeld). Only vers. 464–470 seem to turn upon later Roman times, and to be an insertion (Hilgenfeld, *Apokal.* p. 72; *Zeitschr.* 1871, p. 35 sq.).

The conclusion arrived at is also confirmed by *external testimony*. For according to the information of Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, i. 23 = Syncell. ed. Dindorf, i. 81 = Cyrill. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanh. p. 9, the prophecy of the Sibyl concerning the building of the Tower of Babel and the conflict between the Chronides and Titans which followed it, was already expressly quoted under the name of the Sibyl (*Σίβυλλα δέ φησιν*, etc.) by Alexander Polyhistor, and therefore in the first half of the first century before Christ, in his *Χαλδαικά*.⁶⁸ Such are also found, especially from the third book,⁶⁹ among the oldest patristic quotations.

2. To the oldest Jewish Sibylline oracles undoubtedly belong also the two extensive fragments (together eighty-four verses) communicated by Theophilus, *ad Autol.* ii. 36. Single verses from them are also quoted by other Fathers.⁷⁰ These are not found in our manuscripts. In the editions they are generally printed at the head of the whole collection, because

seems to be not *Φυτὸν ἄλλο*, but the god of war, and *αἰτός*, ver. 399, not to go upon *Φυτὸν ἄλλο*, but upon *γινετήρ*. (2) Alexander Balas was not overthrown by Demetrius II. and Antiochus VII., but by the former and his father-in-law Ptolemy VI. Philometor (1 Macc. xi. 1–19; Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 4. 5–8).

⁶⁸ The quotation in Josephus is taken from Alexander Polyhistor without mention of his name (*Antt.* i. 4. 3 = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 15). See Bleek, i. 148–152. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* p. 25, note. The statements too concerning the building of the Tower of Babel in Abydenus (Euseb. *Chron.* i. 34 and *Praep. evang.* ix. 14. Syncell. i. 81 sq. Cyrill. p. 9).

⁶⁹ Athenagoras, *Suppl.* c. 30. Theophilus, *ad Autol.* ii. 31. Tertullian, *ad nationes*, ii. 12. Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* vi. 70, vii. 74. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohort. ad Graec.* c. 16.

⁷⁰ Gnostic fragment in Hippolyt. *Philosophum.* v. 16. Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* ii. 27; *Protr.* vi. 71 = *Strom.* v. 14. 108; *Protr.* viii. 77 = *Strom.* v. 14. 115; *Strom.* iii. 3. 14. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohort. ad Graec.* c. 16. Lactantius, i. 6. 15–16, 7. 13, 8. 3; ii. 11. 18 (?), 12. 19; iv. 6. 5. *Id. de ira dei*, c. 22. 7.

Theophilus says that they stood at the beginning of the Sibyl's prophecy (ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς προφητείας αὐτῆς). But the present first and second books being very recent and placed quite by accident at the beginning of the collection, and the third book being certainly the oldest part, it may be assumed beforehand that these pieces formed *the introduction to our third book*. This supposition, probable in itself, becomes a certainty through the fact, that Lactantius, among his numerous citations, calls only such portions as are found in the Theophilus fragments and in our third book, prophecies of the Erythraean Sibyl, nay evidently quotes both as parts of one book.⁷¹ The contents of these verses may be called the special programme of all Jewish Sibyllism: they contain an energetic direction to the only true God and as energetic a polemic against idolatry. From no portion can the tendency of Jewish Sibyllism be better perceived than from this poem.

3. Section iii. 36–92 (according to another computation: vers. 36–62 of the intermediate section between Books ii. and iii. and Book iv. 1–30), now standing at the beginning of the third book, is also a Jewish fragment of the prae-Christian period. Bleek already perceived, that this fragment proceeded from an Alexandrian Jew of the time of the first triumvirate

⁷¹ Comp. Bleek, i. 160–166. Lactantius distinguishes the different books as different Sibyls. When after quoting from one book he makes a quotation from another, he says: *alia Sibylla dicit*. Among his somewhere about fifty quotations, extending over Books iii. to viii. of our collection, only those from the poem preserved in Theophilus and from the third book, are entitled prophecies of the Erythraean Sibyl. From the poem: Lact. i. 6. 18–16, 8. 3; ii. 12. 19; iv. 6. 5. From the third book: Lact. ii. 16. 1 (=Sib. iii. 228, 229, ed. Friedlieb); iv. 6. 5 (=Sib. iii. 774); iv. 15. 29 (=Sib. iii. 814–817); vii. 19. 9 (=Sib. iii. 618); vii. 20. 1–2 (=Sib. iii. 741, 742); vii. 24. 12 (=Sib. iii. 787–793). The passage, Lact. iv. 6. 5, is however the most instructive: Sibylla Erythraea in carminis sui principio, quod a summo Deo exorsa est, filium Dei ducem et imperatorem omnium his versibus praedicat: παντοκράτορον κτίστην ὅστις γλυκύ πνεῦμα ἄψαι || πάντοτε, ἡ ἡγήτορα θεῶν πάντων ἐποίησε (=proem, vers. 5–6). Et rursus in fine ejusdem carminis: αὐτὸν ἰδὼκε θεός· πιστοῖς ἀνδράσιν γαρύρειν (=Sib. iii. 774, ed. Friedlieb). Et alia Sibylla praecipit hunc oportere cognosci: αὐτὸν σὺν γέλωτι θεῶν, θεοῦ υἱὸν ἰότα (=Sib. viii. 329). Here then it is plainly said, that the poem belongs to our third book.

(40–30 B.C.), and he has justly found general acquiescence. So Gfrörer, Lücke, Friedlieb, Hilgenfeld (*Apokal.* p. 241), Reuss, Larocque (at least for vers. 26–52) and Wittichen. Only Badt (pp. 54–61) goes as far as 25 B.C., thinking, according to a suggestion made by Frankel, that the *Σεβαστηνοί* of ver. 63 must mean inhabitants of Sebaste-Samaria. Alexandre and Ewald indeed ascribe the oracle to a Christian author of the time of the Antonines (Alexandre), or even of about A.D. 300 (Ewald). Bleek's view is however the best founded. The piece begins with a cry of woe to the wicked race, which is full of all crimes. With this is combined the prophecy, that when Rome rules over Egypt also, then will begin the judgment and the rule of the Messianic King. Even this definition of time: "when Rome rules over Egypt *also*" (ver. 46: *Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Ῥώμῃ καὶ Αἰγύπτου βασιλεύσει*), points to a period when the rule of Rome over Egypt was something new, therefore to the time of Antony, soon after 40 B.C. The date becomes perfectly clear by the allusion to the triumvirate of Antony, Octavius, and Lepidus (ver. 52: *Τρεῖς Ῥώμην οἰκτρῇ μοίρῃ καταδηλήσονται*), and by the mention of the widow, under whose hands the world finds itself being governed by her and obeying her in all things, i.e. Cleopatra (vers. 75–80). Hence the oracle was written between 40 and 30 B.C. To go farther down is inadmissible, the end being expected during the lifetime of Cleopatra. The mention of the *Σεβαστηνοί* (ver. 63), on account of which Badt would place the oracle as late as 25 B.C., may safely be laid to the account of a later interpolator. It is probable, as Bleek and Lücke suppose, that the bracketed words in vers. 60–63 should be expunged,—

Ἡξει γὰρ, ὁπότεν θείου διαβήσεται ὁδμῇ
 Πᾶσιν ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν, [Ἀτὰρ τὰ ἕκαστ' ἀγορεύσω,
 Ὅσσαις ἐν πόλεσιν μέρονες κακότητα φέρουσιν,
 Ἐκ δὲ Σεβαστηνῶν ἥξει] Βελίᾳ μετόπισθεν.

4. Opinions are more divided concerning the *fourth book* than with regard to the passages hitherto treated of. The

majority of older critics regard it as Christian. Friedlieb, Ewald, Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr.* 1871, pp. 44-50) and especially Badt (1878) admit a Jewish author and place its composition about A.D. 80.⁷² This view must be allowed to pass as correct. For there is nothing at all specifically Christian in the book. The Sibyl, who at the commencement calls herself the prophetess of the true God, proclaims by His commission manifold calamities through war, earthquakes and other natural events to the cities, countries, and peoples of Asia and Europe. Unless they repent, God will destroy the whole world by fire and will then raise men from the dead and sit in judgment, sending the ungodly to Tartarus and bestowing a new life on earth upon the godly. There is nothing in these particulars to recall the Christian sphere of thought, although it would hardly be possible to a Christian author to avoid mentioning Christ, when writing on eschatology. Nor are there any grounds for supposing the author to have been an Essene (so Ewald and Hilgenfeld). For the polemic against animal sacrifices (ver. 29) is only directed against heathen sacrifices; and the baptism to which the heathen are summoned is merely Jewish proselyte baptism (comp. Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 323). For determining the date of composition it is decisive, that the destruction of Jerusalem (vers. 115-127) and the eruption of Vesuvius of A.D. 79 (vers. 130-136) are presupposed. The author also believes with many of his contemporaries in Nero's flight across the Euphrates and his impending return (vers. 117-124, 137-139). Consequently the oracle must have been composed about A.D. 80 or not much later, and more probably in Asia Minor (so *e.g.* Lightfoot and Badt) than in Palestine (so Freudenthal). The patristic quotations from this book begin with Justin.⁷³ It is also noteworthy that two

⁷² So too Lightfoot (*St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 2nd ed. 1876, p. 96 sq.) and Freudenthal (*Alex. Polyhistor*, pp. 129, 195). Comp. also my account of the work of Badt in the *Theol. Litztg.* 1878, p. 358. Dechent again gives his decision for the Christian authorship, *Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* ii. 491-496.

⁷³ Justin. *Apol.* i. 20 (refers to *Sib.* iv. 172-177). Clemens Alex. *Protrept.*

verses included in it (97-98) are already mentioned by Strabo, p. 536, as oracular sayings.

5. Very divergent are the decisions of critics concerning the *fifth book*. Bleek distinguishes the following portions as Jewish:—(a) vers. 260-285, 481-531, written about the middle of the second century before Christ, by an Alexandrian Jew; (b) vers. 286-332 by a Jew of Asia Minor soon after A.D. 20; (c) perhaps also vers. 342-433 by a Jewish author about A.D. 70. While Lücke entirely, and Gfrörer at least partly, agree with Bleek, Friedlieb ascribes the whole fifth book to a Jew of the beginning of Hadrian's reign, and Badt to a Jew of about A.D. 130; Ewald, Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr.* 1871, pp. 37-44) and Hildebrandt regard at least Book v. 52-531 as the work of a Jew of about A.D. 80 (Ewald) or a few years earlier (Hilgenfeld, Hildebrandt); while Alexandre, Reuss and Dechent (*Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.* ii. 497 sqq.) attribute the book to a Christian Jew. It seems to me a vain effort to attempt to settle in detail the origin and date of composition of the pieces combined in this book. For it is palpable, that we have here no compact whole, but a loose conglomerate of heterogeneous portions. *The greater number are certainly of Jewish origin*; for the sections, in which Jewish interests and views are brought more or less plainly forward, run through the whole book (comp. especially vers. 260-285, 328-332, 344-360, 397-413, 414-433, 492-511). On the other hand the remarkable passage vers. 256-259, in which "the excellent man coming from heaven who spreads out his hands on the fruit-bearing tree" (Jesus) is identified with Joshua (Jesus the son of Nave) is certainly Christian.⁷⁴ Thus Jewish and Christian pieces are at all

iv. 50 and 62; *Paedag.* ii. 10. 99, iii. 3. 15; *Constit. apostol.* v. 7. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohort.* c. 16. Lactant. vii. 23. 4. *Id. de ira dei*, c. 23 (three passages).

⁷⁴ Sib. vers. 256-259:—

Εἰς δὲ τις ἰσσεταὶ αὐθις ἀπ' αἰθέρος ἔξοχος ἀνὴρ,
 Οὐ παλάμας ἤπλωσεν ἐπὶ ξύλον πολύκαρπον
 Ἑβραίων ὁ ἀριστος, ὃς ἡλιόν ποτε στήσεν,
 Φωτίζας ῥήτι τε καλῇ καὶ χ' ἰλίσιον ἀγνοῖς.



events combined in this book. The summing up of the discrepant elements under the common term "Judæo-Christian" is as unhappy an expedient as it is *e.g.* in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. When however the mixture of Jewish and Christian pieces in this fifth book is acknowledged, it cannot in many instances, where religion is a matter of indifference, be determined to which side they belong. So much only is certain, that the Jewish element preponderates. With such characteristics it is also impossible to determine the respective *dates of composition*. In the Jewish pieces the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem (397-413) and apparently the destruction also of the Onias-temple in Egypt (so far as vers. 492-511 refer to this) are lamented. These pieces and consequently the main body of the book might then have been written in the first century after Christ. On the other hand, the chronological oracle at the beginning (vers. 1-51) certainly leads as far as to the time of Hadrian. Quotations are first found in Clemens Alexandrinus.⁷⁵

6. Of the remaining books, vi. vii. and viii. are generally and correctly esteemed to be of Christian authorship.⁷⁶ The origin on the other hand of Books i.-ii. and xi.-xiv. is doubtful. Most investigators regard these also as Christian. Lücke, Friedlieb and Dechent on the contrary ascribe Book xi. and Friedlieb Book xiv. also to a Jewish author. Dechent attempts, as Friedlieb also partly does, to point out in Books i. and ii. Jewish pieces of greater extent. How difficult it is to find sure footing in this respect is proved by the circumstance, that Lücke in a later section of his work (*Einl. die Offenb. des Joh.* p. 269 sqq.) retracted his view concerning Book xi. and ascribed it to a Christian author.⁷⁷ This eleventh book is

⁷⁵ Clem. Alex. *Protrept.* iv. 50; *Paedag.* ii. 10. 99.

⁷⁶ The eighth book (viii. 217-250) contains the famous acrostic upon Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς θεοῦ υἱὸς σωτὴρ σαρρηνός, which is also given in Constantine's *Oratio ad sanct. coet.* (= Euseb. *Vita Const.* v.) c. 18.

⁷⁷ So also Bleek in his notice of Lücke's book (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1854, p. 976). According to this the statement in Dechent (*Dissert.* p. 49), that Bleek's view concerning Book xi. "was not known," must be corrected.

really not worth contesting. It is a religiously colourless versified history of Egypt down to the beginning of the Roman supremacy, and may just as well be Jewish as Christian. Nor is it very different with the other pieces. The portions separated by Dechent from Books i. and ii. *may* in fact be Jewish, but they may just as well be Christian, and their entire lack of attestation by the Fathers of the first three centuries rather speaks for a later, *i.e.* a Christian origin.⁷⁸

The most ancient author who quotes a Jewish Sibylline book (and indeed *Sib.* iii. 97 sqq. ed. Friedlieb) is Alexander Polyhistor about 80–40 B.C. See the passage from his *Χαλδαϊκά* in Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, i. 23 = Syncell. ed. Dindorf, i. 81 = Cyrill. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanh. p. 9. The almost verbally identical passage in Josephus, *Antt.* i. 4. 3 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ix. 15), is copied from Alexander Polyhistor without mention of his name. Comp. p. 282 above.

On the use of the Sibyllines by the Fathers, see Vervorst, *De carminibus Sibyllinis apud sanctos Patres disceptatio*, Paris 1844. Besançon, *De l'emploi que les Pères de l'église ont fait des oracles sibyllins*, Montauban 1851. Alexandre's 1st ed. vol. ii. (1856) pp. 254–311. A collection of the most ancient quotations is also given in Harnack's *Patres apostol.*, note on Hermas, *Vis.* ii. 4. A thorough discussion of the numerous citations in Lactantius is given by Struve, *Fragmenta librorum Sibyllinorum quae apud Lactantium reperiuntur*, Regiom. 1817. A manuscript collection by the Scotchman Sedulius (ninth century) of the quotations in Lactantius is printed in Montfaucon's *Paleogr. gr. lib.* iii. cap. vii. pp. 243–247, and from this in Gallandi's *Biblioth. patr.* i. 400–406, comp. his *proleg.* p. lxxxii.

Whether Clemens Romanus has quoted the Sibyllines is doubtful. For it is said in the pseudo-Justinian *Quaestt. et respons. ad orthodoxos*, quaest. 74 (*Corp. apolog.* ed. Otto, 3rd ed. vol. v. p. 108): *εἰ τῆς παρούσης καταστάσεως τὸ τέλος ἐστὶν ἡ διὰ τοῦ πυρὸς κρίσις τῶν ἀσεβῶν, καθά φασιν αἱ γραφαὶ προφητῶν τε καὶ ἀποστόλων, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς Σιβύλλης, καθὼς φησιν ὁ μακάριος Κλήμης ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ.* The Sibyl not being mentioned in the received text of the Clementine Epistles, the *καθὼς* must

⁷⁸ The oldest testimony which Dechent (*Dissert.* p. 37) can point out, is found in Constantine's *Oratio ad sanct. coet.* (= Euseb. *Vita Const.* v.) c. 18: *ἡ τοίνυν Ἐρυθραία Σίβυλλα φάσκουσα ἰαντὴν ἐκτὴ γενιᾷ, μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμόν, γινέσθαι.* Comp. *Sib.* i. 283 sqq.

probably be taken as parallel to the *κατά*, and thus the words *ἐν δὲ καὶ τῆς Σιβύλλης* are not the words of Clement but of the pseudo-Justin. Comp. Harnack's 2nd ed. of the Clementine Epistles, Proleg. p. xl.; Otto in his note on the passage is of the contrary opinion. Hermas, *Vis.* ii. 4, mentions only the Sibyl and not the Sibylline books. Quotations from the latter are on the other hand given in the *Predicatio Petri et Pauli* in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* vi. 5. 42-43 (see also Lücke, *Einl. in die Offenb. Joh.* p. 238; Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra canon. rec.* fasc. iv. 2nd ed. pp. 57, 63 sq.). Gnostics in Hippolyt. *Philosophum.* v. 16. Justin. *Apol.* i. 20. Athenagoras, *Suppl.* c. 30. Theophilus, *ad Autol.* ii. 3. 31, 36. Tertullian, *ad nationes*, ii. 12. Pseudo-Melito, *Apol.* c. 4 (in Otto, *Corp. apolog.* vol. ix. pp. 425, 463 sq.). Pseudo-Justin. *Cohortat. ad Graec.* c. 16, 37-38. Const. *Apost.* v. 7. Constantini *Oratio ad sanct. coet.* (= Euseb. *Vita Const.* v.) c. 18-19. Quotations abound most in Clemens Alex. and Lactantius.

Clemens Alexandrinus quotes: (1) The prooemium: *Protrept.* ii. 27. *Protr.* vi. 71 = *Strom.* v. 14. 108. *Protr.* viii. 77 = *Strom.* v. 14. 115. *Strom.* iii. 3. 14. (2) The third book: *Protr.* vi. 70, vii. 74. (3) The fourth book: *Protrept.* iv. 50 and 62. *Paedag.* ii. 10. 99, iii. 3. 15. (4) The fifth book: *Protrept.* iv. 50. *Paedag.* ii. 10. 99. Comp. also *Strom.* i. 21. 108, 132. *It is seen from these statistics that just the three books which on internal grounds we esteem (or at least their greater part) to be Jewish, and these only, were known to Clement.* Other patristic quotations too down to Clement refer to these books alone. They thus evidently form the most ancient Jewish body of Sibylline oracles.

Lactantius quotes about fifty passages from our Sibyllines, most frequently from Book viii., next to this from Book iii., only sometimes from Books iv. v. vi. and vii., from the rest not at all. See the material in Struve and Alexandre. Hence it seems, that he was acquainted with only Books iii. to viii. of our present collection. He must however have had in them somewhat which is lacking in our MSS.; for apart from the passages from the *prooemium*, which indeed is only preserved to us by Theophilus, other quotations are also found in Lactantius, which cannot be pointed out in our texts, Lact. vii. 19. 2, viii. 24. 2. The verses too cited by Lactantius, ii. 11. 18, and very probably belonging to the prooemium, are not contained in Theophilus. Lactantius expresses himself in general on the books known to him as follows: *Inst.* 1, 6 (after an enumeration of the *ten* Sibyls), *Harum omnium Sibyllarum carmina et feruntur et habentur praeterquam Cymaeae, cujus libri a Romanis occuluntur nec eos ab ullo nisi a quindecimviris inspectos habent.*

Et sunt singularum singuli libri, qui quia Sibyllae nomine inscribuntur, unius esse creduntur; suntque confusi, nec discerni ac suum cuique adsignari potest, nisi Erythraeae, quae et nomen suum verum carmini inseruit, et Erythraeam se nominat, ubi praelocuta est, quum esset orta Babylone.

Celsus also testifies to the credit of the Sibyllines among Christians (Orig. c. *Celsus*, vi. 61, vii. 53, 56). Celsus, however, already charges the Christians with having forged the oracles, nor were such charges subsequently wanting. Comp. the allusions in Constantine's *Oratio ad sanct. coet.* (= Euseb. *Vita Const.* v.) c. 19. 1. Lactant. *Inst.* iv. 15. 26. Augustine, *de civ. Dei*, xviii. 46.

On the credit and use of the Sibyllines in the *Middle Ages*, see Alexandre's 1st ed. ii. 287–311. Lücken, "Die sibyllinischen Weissagungen, ihr Ursprung und ihr Zusammenhang mit den afterprophetischen Darstellungen christlicher Zeit" (*Katholische Studien*, No. V.), Würzb. 1875. Vogt, "Ueber Sibyllenweissagung" (*Beiträge zur Gesch. der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, edited by Paul and Braune, vol. iv. 1877, pp. 48–100). Bang, *Voluspá und die sibyllinischen Orakel*, translated from the Danish, Wien 1880.

On the manuscripts, see Friedlieb, *De codicibus Sibyllinorum manuscriptis in usum criticum nondum adhibitis commentatio*, Vratislav. 1847. Friedlieb's edition, Introd. p. lxxii. sqq. and App. pp. ix.–xii. Alexandre's 1st ed. vol. i. p. xliii. sqq.; his 2nd ed. pp. xxxviii.–xlii. Volkmann, *Lectiones Sibyllinae*, Pyritz 1861. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griech. Literatur*, ii. 1 (3rd ed. 1867), p. 452 sq.

On the editions, see Gallandi, *Biblioth. patr.* i. p. 81. Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, i. 257–261. Bleek, i. p. 123 sq. Alexandre's 1st ed. vol. i. pp. xxx.–xliii. The first edition superintended by Xystus Betuleius, according to an Augsburg now a Munich manuscript, was brought out by Oporinus in Basle 1545. The same with a Latin translation by Seb. Castalio (which first appeared separately in 1546), Basle 1555. The most esteemed among the older editions is that of Opsopöus, Paris 1599 (repeated in 1607; the account by the bibliographers of a supposed edition of 1589 rests upon a mistake). The edition of Gallaeus, Amsterdam 1689, is less esteemed. The Sibyllines have appeared besides in various collections, e.g. in Gallandi's *Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, vol. i. (Venetiis 1788) pp. 333–410; comp. Proleg. pp. lxxvi.–lxxxii. *All these editions contain only the first eight books.* The fourteenth book was first published from a Milan manuscript by Angelo Mai (*Sibyllae liber xiv. editore et interprete Angelo Maio*, Mediolan. 1817); and afterwards Books xi. to xiv. from two

Vatican manuscripts by the same (*Scriptorum veterum nova collectio ed. ab Angelo Maio*, vol. iii. 3, 1828, pp. 202–215). Everything hitherto known is combined in the editions of Alexandre (*Oracula Sibyllina, curante C. Alexandre*, 2 vols. Paris 1841–1856. *Editio altera ex priore ampliore contracta, integra tamen et passim aucta, multisque locis retractata*, Paris 1869 [the copious Excursi of the first edition are omitted in this second one]) and of Friedlieb (*Die sibyllinischen Weissagen vollständig gesammelt, nach neuer Handschriften-Vergleichung, mit kritischen Commentare und metrischer deutscher Uebersetzung*, Leipzig 1852). A Latin translation is added to most editions, a German one to that of Friedlieb. A French one has been commenced by Bouché Leclercq (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, vol. vii. 1883, pp. 236–248; vol. viii. 1883, pp. 619–634, etc.).

Contributions to textual criticism: Volkmann, *De oraculis Sibyllinis dissertatio, supplementum editionis a Friedliebbo exhibitae*, Lips. 1853. The same, *Specimen novae Sibyllinorum editionis*, Lips. 1854 (containing the first book). A discussion of Alexandre's edition in the *Philologus*, vol. xv. 1860, p. 317 sqq. The same, *Lectiones Sibyllinae*, Pyritz 1861. X., "Zur Textkritik der sibyllin. Bücher" (*Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1861, pp. 437–439). Meineke, "Zu den sibyllinischen Büchern" (*Philologus*, vol. xxviii. 1869, pp. 577–598). Ludwich, "Zu den sibyllinischen Orakeln" (*Neue Jahrb. für Philol. und Pädagogik*, vol. cxvii. 1878, pp. 240–245). Nauck, "Kritische Bemerkungen" (*Mélanges gréco-romains tirés du bulletin de l'académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, vol. ii. 1859–1866, p. 484 sq.; iii. 1869–1874, pp. 278–282; iv. 1875–1880, pp. 155–157, 630–642). Rzach, "Zur Kritik der Sibyllinischen Weissagen" (*Wiener Studien*, vol. iv. 1882, pp. 121–129). More in Engelmann's *Biblioth. script. class.* ed. Preuss.

Lists of the literature on the Sibyllines in general are given in Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, i. 227–290. Bleek, i. 129–141. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Neuen Testaments*, § 274. Alexandre's 1st ed. ii. 2. 71–82, also 2nd ed. p. 418 sq. Engelmann, *Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum* (8th ed. revised by Preuss), Div. i. 1880, p. 528 sq. The first to investigate the collection according to correct critical principles was: Bleek, "Ueber die Entstehung und Zusammensetzung der uns in 8 Büchern erhaltenen Sammlung Sibyllinischer Orakel" (*Theologische Zeitschrift*, edited by Schleiermacher, de Wette and Lücke, No. 1, 1819, pp. 120–246; No. 2, 1820, pp. 172–239). Comp. also his notice of Lücke's *Einl.* in the *Stud. und Krit.* 1854, pp. 972–979. Gfrörer, *Philo.* vol. ii. 1831, pp. 121–173. Lücke, *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die*

Offenbarung des Johannes (2nd ed. 1852), pp. 66–89, 248–274. Friedlieb's Introd. to his edition (1852). Alexandre's 1st ed. ii. 312–439; 2nd ed. p. 21 sqq. Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (1857), pp. 51–90. The same, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, vol. iii. 1860, pp. 313–319; xiv. 1871, pp. 30–50. Ewald, "Abhandlung über Entstehung Inhalt und Werth der Sibyllischen Bucher" (*Transactions of the Göttinger Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* vol. viii. 1858–1859, hist.-philol. Class. pp. 43–152, also separately). Frankel, "Alexandrinische Messias Hoffnungen" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1859, pp. 241–261, 285–308, 321–330, 359–364). Volkmann in the "Philologus," vol. xv. 1860, pp. 317–327. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griechischen Literatur*, ii. 1 (3rd ed. 1867), pp. 441–453. Reuss, art. "Sibyllen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xiv. 1861, pp. 315–329 (2nd ed. xiv. 1884, pp. 179–191). The same, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments*, 1881, § 489, 490, 537. Zündel, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Abfassungszeit des Buches Daniel*, 1861, pp. 140–172. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi*, 1866, pp. 169–174. Badt, *De oraculis Sibyllinis a Judæis compositis*, Bresl. 1869. The same, *Ursprung, Inhalt und Text des vierten Buches der sibyllinischen Orakel*, Breslau 1878. Larocque, "Sur la date du troisième livre des Oracles sibyllins" (*Revue archéologique*, new series, vol. xx. 1869, pp. 261–270). Wittichen, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes*, 1872, pp. 134–144, 160 sq. Dechent, *Ueber das erste, zweite und elfte Buch der sibyllinischen Weissagungen*, Frankf. 1873. The same, "Charakter und Geschichte der altchristlichen Sibyllenschriften" (*Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch.* vol. ii. 1878, pp. 481–509). Hildebrandt, "Das römische Antichristenthum zur Zeit der Offenbarung Johannis und des fünften sibyllinischen Buches" (*Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol.* 1874, pp. 57–95). Delaunay, *Moines et Sibylles dans l'antiquité judéo-grecque*, Paris 1874. Renan, *Journal des Savants*, 1874, pp. 796–809. Delitzsch, "Versuchte Lösung eines sibyllischen Räthfels" [on i. 137–146], *Zeitschr. für luth. Theol.* 1877, pp. 216–218. *The Edinburgh Review*, No. 299, July 1877, pp. 31–67. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, 1877, pp. 10–17. Nicolai, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, vol. iii. 1878, pp. 335–338.

2. *Hystaspes.*

Ammianus Marcellinus (xxiii. 6. 32–33) relates of Hystaspes the Mede, the father of King Darius, that during his sojourn

among the Indian Brahmins, he learned from them "the laws of the motions of the world and stars and *pure religious customs*" (*purosque sacrorum ritus*), and then imparted some of these to the native Magi, who handed them down to posterity. A Greek work under the name of this Hystaspes, who was thus regarded by antiquity as an authority in religious matters, was known to the Fathers, by whom the following indications concerning it are given. According to Justin, the future destruction of the world by fire was therein predicted. In the *Praedicatio Petri et Pauli* cited by Clemens Alex. it is asserted, that Hystaspes plainly referred to the Son of God, and to the conflict of Messiah and his people with many kings, and to his steadfastness (*ἰσχυροσύνη*) and glorious appearing (*παρουσία*). Lastly, according to Lactantius the destruction of the Roman Empire was foretold in it, and also that in the tribulation of the last times, the pious and believing would pray to Zeus for assistance, and that Zeus would hear them and destroy the ungodly. Lactantius finds fault here only with the circumstance, that what God will do is ascribed to Zeus, and at the same time laments, that in consequence of the deceit of the daemons, *nothing* is here said of the sending of the Son of God. From these notices it is evident, that the work was of an apocalyptic and eschatological tenor. Since Lactantius expressly says, that the sending of the Son of God to judge the world is *not* mentioned in it, we must regard it as rather Jewish than Christian. The choice too of Zeus as the name of God, corresponding more with the literary usages of Hellenistic Judaism than with those of Christianity, speaks for its Jewish origin. What the author also of the *Praedicatio Petri et Pauli* says concerning the appearance of the Messiah prophesied of in Scripture, does not go beyond the framework of Jewish expectation. The apparent contradiction between his statement and that of Lactantius may be explained by remembering, that Lactantius only misses the co-operation of the Messiah at the day of judgment. Yet it may be also possible

that the author of the *Praedicatio Petri et Pauli* had an interpolated copy before him. The limits of the date of composition are fixed by the appearance on the one side of the Roman Empire as the power hostile to God, on the other by Justin's acquaintance with the work.

Justin. *Apol.* i. 20: Καὶ Σίβυλλα δὲ καὶ Ἰσδάσης γενήσεσθαι τῶν φθαρτῶν ἀνάλωσιν διὰ πυρὸς ἔφασαν. Comp. also c. 44.

Praedicatio Petri et Pauli in Clemens Alex. *Strom.* vi. 5. 42-43 (comp. Lucke, *Einl. in die Offenb. Joh.* p. 238; Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra canonem rec.* fasc. iv. 2nd ed. pp. 57, 63 sq.): Λάβετε καὶ τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς βίβλους, ἐπίγνωτε Σίβυλλαν, ὡς δηλοῖ ἔσα θεὸν καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα ἰσθῆναι, καὶ τὴν Ἰσδάσιν λαβόντες ἀνάγνωτε, καὶ εὐρήσετε πολλῶν τηλαυγίστερον καὶ σαφίστερον γεγραμμένον τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ καθὼς παράταξιν ποιήσουσι τῷ Χριστῷ πολλοὶ βασιλεῖς μισοῦντες αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς φοροῦντας τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τοὺς πιστοὺς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ὑπομοιήν καὶ τὴν παρουσίαν αὐτοῦ.

Lactantius, *Inst.* vii. 15. 19: Hystaspes quoque, qui fuit Medorum rex antiquissimus . . . admirabile somnium sub interpretatione vaticinantis pueri ad memoriam posteris tradidit, *sublatum iri ex orbe imperium nomenque Romanum*, multo ante praefatus, quam illa Troiana gens conderetur. *Ibid.* vii. 18. 2-3: Hystaspes enim, quem superius nominavi, descripta iniquitate saeculi hujus extremi, pios ac fideles a nocentibus segregatos ait cum fletu et gemitu extensuros esse ad coelum manus et imploraturos fidem Jovis; Jovem respecturum ad terram et auditurum voces hominum atque impios extincturum. Quae omnia vera sunt, praeter unum, quod Jovem dixit illa facturum, quae Deus faciet. Sed et illud non sine daemonum fraude subtractum est, missum iri a patre tunc filium Dei, qui deletis omnibus malis pios liberet.

Comp. in general: Walch, "De Hystaspe" (*Commentationes societatis scientt.* Gotting. vol. ii. 1780). Fabricius - Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* i. 108 sq. A. G. Hoffmann in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encykl.* § 2, vol. xiii. 1836, p. 71 sq. Lücke. *Einl. in die Offenbarung des Johannes*, 2nd ed. pp. 237-240. Otto's *Anmerkung zu Justin* as above (in his edition of the *Corpus apologet.*).

3 Forged Verses of Greek Poets.

Both Jewish and Christian apologists repeatedly appeal to the most eminent *Greek poets* to prove, that the more intelligent among the Greeks held correct views concerning the nature

of God, His unity, spirituality and supramundane character. Many such quotations, especially in Clemens Alexandrinus, are really taken from the genuine works of these poets, and have been skilfully selected and explained by the apologists.⁷⁹ But among these genuine quotations are also to be found not a few which have been palpably forged in the interest of either Jewish or Christian apologetic. The works where such forged verses have been discovered are chiefly the following:

1. Aristobulus in Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*, xiii. 12.
2. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* v. 14; also given in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 13; comp. also *Protrept.* vii. 74.
3. The pseudo-Justinian *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, c. 15 and 18.
4. The pseudo-Justinian work, *De monarchia*, c. 2-4 (the two latter in Otto's *Corpus apologetarum christian.* vol. iii.).

The authors to whom the verses are ascribed, are: the great tragic poets Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides; the writers of comedies, Philemon, Menander, Diphilus; a large fragment is ascribed to Orpheus; and certain verses on the Sabbath to Hesiod, Homer and Linus (or Callimachus).

In forming a judgment concerning the origin of these pieces the following considerations are of importance. Almost all the portions, which come under notice, are found both in Clemens Al. *Str.* v. 14. 113-133 (=Eus. *Pr.* xiii. 13. 40-62, ed. Gaisford), and in the pseudo-Justinian work, *De monarchia*, c. 2-4. Aristobulus and the *Cohortatio ad Graecos* have only single verses and such as are found in the others also. Both in Clement and in the work *De monarchia* however, the suspicious portions stand pretty thick together; in the *De monarchia* indeed almost without other accessories. It is thus clear that either one made use of the other or that

⁷⁹ So e.g. the celebrated commencement of the *Phaenomena* of Aratus (third century B.C.): 'Ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχόμεθα, τὸν οὐρανὸν ἄνδρες ἰῶσιν ἀβήτονον, etc., from which is derived the saying quoted, Acts xvii. 28: τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἰσμεῖν. The Jewish philosopher Aristobulus (in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 6, ed. Gaisford) already quotes this verse; also Theophilus, *ad Autol.* ii. 8. Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 101=Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 13. 26.

both drew from a common source. A strict observation shows however that the former supposition cannot be accepted. For though the pieces quoted are almost all identical, they are more completely and accurately given now by one now by another.⁸⁰ It is then indubitable that both *drew from a common source*, in which all the suspected pieces were probably found together. What this source was moreover we are directly told by Clement: it was the *work of the pseudo-Hecataeus on Abraham*. For Clement introduces the first of the suspected quotations, a supposed portion of Sophocles, with the words (*Strom.* v. 14. 113 = *Eus. Pr.* xiii. 13. 40, ed. Gaisford): 'Ὁ μὲν Σοφοκλῆς, ὡς φησιν Ἑκαταῖος ὁ τὰς ιστορίας συνταξάμενος ἐν τῇ κατ' Ἀβραμὸν καὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, ἀντικρὺς ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐκβοᾷ. Böckh already showed that he on the whole correctly perceived the state of matters by ascribing all the quotations from the scenic poets (tragic and comic) to the pseudo-Hecataeus. Hence it was no advance when Nauck, *e.g.* (in his edition of the *Fragm. tragic.*), and Otto (in his notes in the *Corp. apologet.*) again spoke of Christian forgeries, for the work of the pseudo-Hecataeus is certainly Jewish. The verdict of Böckh must however be also extended to the large portion from Orpheus and to the verses of Hesiod, Homer and Linus on the Sabbath, which

⁸⁰ *De monarchia*, c. 3, *e.g.* comp. with Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 121-122 (= *Euseb. Praep. ev.* xiii. 13. 47-48), is instructive. First a portion from Sophocles is given in *De monarchia* (ἴσται γάρ, ἴσται, etc.). Then Clement has the same portion but divided into two halves; and the second half is introduced by the formula: καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα αὖτις ἐπιφέρει. Undoubtedly Clement is here the more original. The author of *De monarchia* joined together the two pieces which are not directly connected. A contrary relation takes place in the next following, but in Clement preceding, piece: οἱς οὐ τοὺς θανάτους, of which Clement ascribes the whole to Diphilus, while the author of *De monarchia* ascribes the first and longer half to Philemon, the second and shorter to Euripides. In the latter ascription he is correct, for it contains a few genuine verses of Euripides, which are completed by spurious ones (see Dindorf's note in his edition of Clement). Here then the work "*De monarchia*" preserves the original; Clement by an oversight ascribing the two unconnected pieces to one author.

are already cited by Aristobulus (in Euseb. xiii. 12) and the forgery of which is therefore set by many, *e.g.* Valckenaer, and also Böckh to the credit of Aristobulus. The Orphean piece is also found both in Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 123 sqq. (=Euseb. xiii. 13. 50 sqq.) and in the work *De monarchia*, c. 2, in the midst of the forged verses of the tragic and comic poets. And the testimonies of Hesiod and Homer concerning the Sabbath stand at least near in Clement (*Strom.* v. 14. 107 =Euseb. xiii. 13. 34), and in juxtaposition, along with the Orphean piece, certainly in Aristobulus. It is hence very probable that these forgeries also belong to the pseudo-Hecataeus.

If our conjecture is correct, these forgeries belong to the *third century before Christ*; for such is the date of the pseudo-Hecataeus (see next paragraph). It seems that numerous passages from Greek poets were collected in his work, as testimonies to the true belief in God, that among them many were certainly genuine, but that these not seeming sufficiently powerful to the author he enhanced and completed them by verses of his own making. The work was certainly in the hands of Clemens Alex. and the author of *De monarchia* in the original.

Comp. in general: Valckenaer, *Diatrise de Aristobulo Judaeo* (Lugd. Bat. 1806), pp. 1-16, 73-125. Böckh, *Graecae tragodiae principum, Aeschyli Sophoclis Euripidis, num ea quae supersunt et genuina omnia sint et forma primitiva servata, an eorum familiis aliquid debeat ex iis tribui* (Heidelb. 1808), pp. 146-164 (treats especially on the Jewish forgeries). Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 74 sqq. (on the Orphean verses). Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*, ii. 89-94, 225-228. Meineke, *Menandri et Philemonis reliquiae*, Berol. 1823. The same, *Fragmenta comicorum Graecorum*, vol. iv. Berol. 1841 (among others the Fragments of Philemon, Menander, Diphilus). Nauck, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*, Lips. 1856. Cobet in *Δίγμος Ἑρμῆς ἐκδ. ὑπὸ Κόβου*, vol. i. (Leyden 1866) pp. 176, 454, 459-463, 524. Dindorf's notes on the passages in question in his edition of *Clem. Alex.* Otto's notes on the passages in question in his edition of the *Corpus apologet. christ.* vol. iii. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 566-568 (on the verses quoted by

Aristobulus). Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, pp. 166-169. Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome* (New York 1876), pp. 336-342.

The several portions are (according to their order in the pseudo-Justinian work *De monarchia*) as follows:—

1. Twelve verses of Aeschylus (Χάρις θεῶν τὸν θεόν) on the elevation of God above every creature, *De monarchia*, c. 2 (Otto's *Corpus apologetarum*, 3rd ed. vol. iii. p. 130); Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 131 = Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 13. 60, ed. Gaisford. Böckh, p. 150 sq. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graec. fragm.* p. 100.

2. Nine verses of Sophocles (Εἰς ταῖς ἀληθείαις) on the unity of God, who made heaven and earth, and on the folly of idolatry, *De monarchia*, c. 2 (Otto's *Corpus apolog.* 3rd ed. vol. iii. p. 132); Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 113 = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 13. 40, ed. Gaisford; Clem. *Protrept.* vii. 74; Pseudo-Justin. *Cohort. ad. Graec.* c. 18; Cyrill. Alex. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanh. p. 32; Theodoret, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, c. vii. s. fin. (*Opp.* ed. Schulze, iv. 896); Malalas, ed. Bonnens. p. 40 sq., Cedrenus, ed. Bonnens. i. 82. The two first verses are also in Athenagoras, *Suppl.* c. 5. Böckh, p. 148 sq. Nauck, *Trag. Graec. Fragm.* p. 284 sq. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* ii. 196. Dindorf's note to Clem. *Strom.* v. 14. 113.

3. Two verses, ascribed in *De monarchia*, c. 2, to the comic poet Philemon, but in Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* vi. 68 to Euripides (Θεὸν δὲ πᾶν), treat of God as one who sees everything, but is himself unseen. On their spuriousness, see Meineke, *Fragmenta comicorum Graec.* iv. 67 sq. Nauck, *Trag. Graec. Frag.* p. 552. Otto, *Corp. Apologet.* 3rd ed. vol. iii. p. 132, note 21. Dindorf's note to Clem. *Protr.* l.c.

4. A long piece attributed to Orpheus is extant in two different recensions, which materially differ from each other. The shortest is that in the two pseudo-Justinian works, *de monarchia*, and *Cohort. ad graec.* c. 15. The text is identical in both, only that in *De monarchia* the two introductory verses are omitted. The *Cohortatio* also gives the text with an abbreviation in the midst (Cyrill. Alex. *adv. Julian.* ed. Spanheim, p. 26). The contents of the piece (one-and-twenty verses in the *Cohort.*) turn upon the thought, that there is but one God who made and still governs all things, who is enthroned in supramundane glory in heaven, invisible, yet everywhere present. If further proof of the Jewish origin of these verses were needed, it is clearly found in the thought, borrowed from Isa. lxvi. 1, that heaven is God's throne and earth His footstool—

Οὗτος γὰρ χάλκειον ἐπ' οὐρανὸν ἐστήρικται
Χρυσίῳ ἐν θρόνῳ, γαίης δ' ἐπὶ ποσσὶ βέβηκε.⁸¹

⁸¹ The same verses run according to Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 124=

It is worthy of remark, that the author lays stress on the notion, that evil too is sent by God—

Οὗτος δ' ἐξ ἀγαθῶν κακὸν θνητοῖσι δίδωσι
Καὶ πῶλεμον κρυβέντα καὶ ἄλγεια δακρυέντα.

The whole instruction is addressed to Musaeus the son of Orpheus (to the latter according to *Cohort.* c. 15). According to *Monarchia*, c. 2, it is contained in the "Testament of Orpheus" in which, repenting of his former teaching of 360 gods, he proclaimed the one true God (μαρτυρήσει δέ μοι καὶ 'Ορφεύς, ὁ παρῑσαγαγὼν τοὺς τριακούςις ἐξήκοντα θεούς, ἐν τῷ Διαθήκαι ἐπιγραφομένῳ βιβλίῳ, ὅποτε μετανοῶν ἐπὶ τούτῳ φαίνεται ἐξ ὧν γράφει). Comp. also *Cohort.* c. 15 and 36, and especially in Theophilus, *ad Autol.* iii. 2: τί γὰρ ὠφέλησιν . . . 'Ορφέα οἱ τριακόςιοι ἐξήκοντα πάντα θεοί, οὓς αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τέλει τοῦ βίου ἀθετεῖ, ἐν ταῖς Διαθήκαις αὐτοῦ λέγων ἵνα εἶναι θεόν.

(b) A longer recension of the same Orphean fragment is given by Aristobulus in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 5. At its commencement it coincides on the whole with the before-named recension, but adds considerably more towards the close, especially a reference to the Chaldaean (Abraham), who alone attained to the true knowledge of God. The passage, according to which God is also the inflicter of evil, is here corrected into its opposite—

Αὐτὸς δ' ἐξ ἀγαθῶν θνητοῖς κακὸν οὐκ ἐπιτίλλει
'Ανθρώποις· αὐτῷ δὲ χάρις καὶ μῖσος δπηδεῖ,
Καὶ πόλεμος καὶ λοιμὸς ἦν ἄλγεια δακρυέντα.

Aristobulus names as the source the poems of Orpheus κατὰ τὸν ἱερὸν λόγον (Euseb. *Praep.* xiii. 12. 4: ἔτι δὲ καὶ 'Ορφεύς ἐν ποιήμασι τῶν κατὰ τὸν Ἱερὸν Λόγον αὐτῷ λεγομένων οὕτως ἐκτίθεται).

(c) The quotations in Clemens Alex. *Protrept.* vii. 74; *Strom.* v. 12. 78, and especially *Strom.* v. 14. 123–127 = Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 13. 50–54, ed. Gaisford, represent a third recension. Theodoret, *Graecarum affectionum curatio*, ii. (*Opp.* ed. Schulze, iv. 735 sq.)⁸² again draws from Clement. Clement gives the

Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 13. 51 (and almost exactly so according to Aristobulus in Euseb. *Praep.* xiii. 12. 5)—

Αὐτὸς δ' αὖ μέγαν αὐτῷ ἐκ' οὐρανόθεν ἐστήρικται
Χρυσίῳ σινὶ θρόνῳ, γαίῃ δ' ὑπὸ ποσσὶ βάβηκεν.

Clement already notices the agreement with Isa. lxvi. 1.

⁸² Since it can be proved that Theodoret elsewhere borrows such quotations from Clement, there can be no doubt that his text is in the main a combination of Clem. *Strom.* v. 12. 78 and v. 14. 124. Only the first three verses in Theodoret agree in part more with Aristobulus than with Clem. *Protr.* vii. 74.

text only piecemeal, and broken up into separate quotations. But taking all these together, it is clearly seen, that not only the whole portion, given by Aristobulus, but also considerably more was in his hands. Much as he agrees in the main with Aristobulus (especially in having the passage concerning the Chaldee), this only on the other hand makes the coincidences in many details with the pseudo-Justinian works the more striking. Clement also has in particular the passage concerning the infliction of evil by God in its original form, like the pseudo-Justinian works (*Strom.* v. 14. 126 = Euseb. *Præp.* xiii. 13. 53). On the work of Orpheus, from which the passage is taken, Clement agrees with the others in saying, that Orpheus, "after teaching the orgies and the theology of idols, made a *recantation* conformable with truth by singing, though late, the truly holy doctrine" (*Protrept.* vii. 74: 'Ὀρφεύς, μετὰ τὴν τῶν ὁρλίων ἱεροφαντίαν καὶ τῶν εἰδώλων τὴν θεολογίαν, παλινωδῶν ἀληθείας εἰσάγει, τὸν ἱερὸν ὄντως ὅτι ποτε ὁμῶς δ' οὖν ᾄδων λόγον).

On the relation of the three recensions to each other Lobeck (*Aglaophamus*, i. 438 sqq.) has brought forward the view, that the recension of the Justinian works is the oldest, that of Clemens a more recent and that of Aristobulus the most recent, the latter being of a date subsequent to Clemens Alexandrinus (i. 448: Clementis certe temporibus posteriorem). There is however no constraining reason for the last notion. We have ourselves acknowledged, that the text of Aristobulus is in *one* point secondary in comparison with the other two. That is not however saying, that it is so in every respect. It may be regarded as certain, that none of the three recensions is *directly* the source of the others. Nor can the short portion in the Justinian works be the archetype, for it is evidently only a fragment from a larger copy, probably with abbreviations in the text. The three recensions will thus fall back upon a common source, which has afterwards been subjected to manifold variations. And this source may very well have been the *pseudo-Hecataeus*. In any case this Orphean passage is one of the boldest forgeries ever attempted. It is a *supposed legacy of Orpheus to his son Musaeus, in which, having arrived at the close of his life, he expressly recalls all his other poems, which are dedicated to polytheistic doctrines and proclaims the alone true God*. According to Suidas (*Lex. s.v. 'Ὀρφεύς*) there were *ἱεροὺς λόγους ἐν βασιλεύειαις* καὶ ὁ Ὀρφεύς. This legacy, to speak with Clement, was to be his *true ἱερὸς λόγος*. Comp. on this Jewish piece: Gottfr. Hermann, *Orphica*, pp. 447-453 (the text). Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, pp. 11-16. 73-85. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, i. 438-465 (the most thorough investigation). Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 74 sqq. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilo-*

sophie, ii. 89-94, 225-228. Abel, *Orphica*, pp. 144-148 (the text). On Orpheus and the Orphean literature in general: Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, i. 140-181. Gottfr. Hermann, *Orphica*, Lips. 1805 (collection of the text and fragments). Lobeck, *Aglaophamus sive de theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis*, 2 vols. Regim. Pr. 1829 (chief work). Klausen, art. "Orpheus," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encyclopädie*, § 3, vol. vi. 1835, pp. 9-42. Preller, art. "Orpheus," in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* v. 992-1004. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griech. Literatur*, ii. 1, 3rd ed. 1867, pp. 408-441. Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* i. 445-447, iii. 330-335. Abel, *Orphica*, Lips. 1885 (texts and fragments). Still more literature in Engelmann's *Biblioth. script. class.* ed. Preuss.

5. The next Jewish piece quoted in *De monarchia* is eleven verses of Sophocles on the future destruction of the world by fire, and the different lots of the righteous and unrighteous ("Ἔσται γάρ, ἔσται κείνος αἰῶνος χρόνος"), *De monarchia*, c. 3 (Otto's *Corp. apol.* iii. 136). In Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14, 121-122 = Euseb. *Pr.* xiii. 13. 48, the same verses are cited as words of the *τραγῳδία* without naming Sophocles. In Clemens they are also divided into halves by the remark, καὶ μὴ ὀλίγα αὐτὸς ἐπιφέρει, while pseudo-Justin combines the two halves into a whole. Clement does not give the verses on the different lots of the righteous and unrighteous in this connection, but in the preceding fragment, which he quotes from Diphilus, where they are more suitable (*Strom.* v. 14. 121 = Euseb. *Praep.* viii. 13. 47). Böckh, p. 149 sq. Nauck, *Tragicorum Graec. fragm.* p. 285 sq.


6. Ten verses of the comic poet Philemon on the certain punishment of even hidden sins by the all-knowing and just God (Ὅτι οὐ τοὺς θανόντας), and ten verses of Euripides on the same theme ("Ἀφθονὸν βίου μῆκος"), *De monarchia*, c. 3 (Otto's *Corp. apolog.* iii. 136-140). Part of the Euripidean verses is genuine, the rest spurious (see Dindorf's note to Clemens and Nauck). In Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 121 = Euseb. *Praep.* xiii. 13. 47, both pieces are attributed to the comic poet Diphilus. Theodoret, *Graec. affect. curatio*, c. vi. (*Opp.* ed. Schulze, iv. 854 sq.), also gives the text of Clemens in the extract. Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, pp. 1-8. Böckh, pp. 158-160. Meineke, *Fragm. comicorum Graec.* iv. 67. Nauck, *Tragic. Graec. fragm.* p. 496 sq.

7. Twenty-four verses of Philemon on the theme that a moral life is more needful and of more value than sacrifice (Ἔτις δὲ θυσίαν προσφέρειν), *De monarchia*, c. 4 (Otto's *Corp. apol.* iii. 140 sq.). In Clemens Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 119-120 = Euseb. *Praep.* ev. xiii. 13. 45-46, the same verses are attributed to Menander. Böckh, p. 157 sq., thinks that the piece is based upon single genuine verses.

8. Among the other pieces cited from scenic poets in *De monarchia* and in Clement there are also a few more suspicious verses, which are introduced in *De monarchia*, c. 5 (Otto's *Corp. apol.* iii. 150 sq.), by the formula *Μίναϊδρος ἐν Διφίλῳ*. In Clemens, *Strom.* v. 14. 133 = Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 13. 62, they are ascribed to Diphilus. They summon to the worship of the one true God. Comp. Meineke, *Fragm. com. Graec.* iv. 429 sq. Perhaps too the verses of Sophocles in Clem. *Strom.* v. 14. 111 = Euseb. *Praep.* xiii. 13. 38, in which Zeus is represented in a very unflattering light, are also spurious. Comp. Nauck, *Tragic. Graec. fragm.* p. 285. Dindorf's note to Clemens.

9. Lastly, in this connection must be noticed the verses on the Sabbath, to which Aristobulus and Clement appeal, Aristobulus in Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 12. 13-16. Clem. Alex. *Strom.* v. 14. 87 = Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 13. 34. They are—(a) two verses of Hesiod; (b) three verses of Homer; (c) five verses of Linus, for whom Clement erroneously has Callimachus. The verses are a mixture of genuine and spurious. The divergences in the text between Clement and Aristobulus are but unimportant. Comp. Valckenaer, *De Aristobulo*, pp. 8, 10, 89-125. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iii. 568. Schneider, *Callimachea*, vol. ii. Lips. 1873, p. 412 sq.

4. Hecataeus.



Hecataeus of Abdera (not to be confounded with the far more ancient geographer Hecataeus of Miletus about 500 B.C.) was according to Josephus a contemporary of Alexander the Great and of Ptolemy Lagos (Joseph. c. *Apion.* 22: 'Εκαταῖος δὲ ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης, ἀνὴρ φιλόσοφος ἄμα καὶ περὶ τὰς πράξεις ἰκανώτατος, Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ συνακμάσας καὶ Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Λάγου συγγενόμενος). This statement is also confirmed by other testimony. According to Diogenes, *Laert.* ix. 69, Hecataeus was a hearer of the philosopher Pyrrho, a contemporary of Alexander. According to Diodor. Sic. i. 46, he made, in the time of Ptolemy Lagos, a journey to Thebes. He was a philosopher and historian, and seems to have lived chiefly at the court of Ptolemy. A work on the Hyperboreans (Müller, *Fr.* 1-6), a History of Egypt (Müller, *Fr.* 7-13), and in Suidas' *Lcx. s.v.* 'Εκαταῖος, a work, *περὶ τῆς ποιήσεως*

Ὅμηρον καὶ Ἡσιόδου, of which no other trace is found, are mentioned as his writings.

Under the name of this Hecataeus of Abdera there existed a book "*on the Jews*," or, as it is also entitled, "*on Abraham*," concerning which we have the following testimonies:—

(1) Pseudo-Aristeas quotes Hecataeus as authority for the notion that profane Greek authors do not mention the Jewish law just because the doctrine held forth in it is a sacred one (Aristeas, ed. Mor. Schmidt in Merx' *Archiv.* i. 259 = Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 107: διὸ πρόβρω γεγόνασιν οἱ τε συγγραφεῖς καὶ ποιηταὶ καὶ τὸ τῶν ἱστορικῶν πλῆθος τῆς ἐπιμνήσεως τῶν προειρημένων βιβλίων, καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὰ πεπολιτευμένων καὶ πολιτευομένων ἀνδρῶν, διὰ τὸ ἀγνήν τινα καὶ σεμνήν εἶναι τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς θεωρίαν, ὥς φησιν Ἐκαταῖος ὁ Ἀβδηρίτης. See the passage also in Euseb. *Praep. ev.* viii. 3. 3, and more freely rendered in Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 2. 3). (2) Josephus says that Hecataeus not only incidentally alluded to the Jews, but also wrote a book concerning them (*contra Apion.* i. 22: οὐ παρέργως, ἀλλὰ περὶ αὐτῶν Ἰουδαίων συγγέγραφε βιβλίον; comp. i. 23: βιβλίον ἔγραψε περὶ ἡμῶν). He then gives in the same passage (*contra Apion.* i. 22 = Bekker's ed. vol. vi. pp. 202, 1–205, 22) long extracts from this work concerning the relations between the Jews and Ptolemy Lagos, their fidelity to the law, the organization of their priesthood, and the arrangement of their temple; lastly, a passage is given at the close in which Hecataeus relates an anecdote of which he was himself a witness at the Red Sea: a Jewish knight and archer, who belonged to the expeditionary corps, shot a bird dead, whose flight the augur was anxiously observing, and then derided those who were angry for their awe concerning a bird who did not even foreknow its own fate. Eusebius (*Praep. ev.* ix. 4) also gives single pieces from these extracts of Josephus. From the same source Josephus (*contra Apion.* ii. 4) gives the information that Alexander the Great bestowed upon the Jews the country of Samaria as a district exempt from taxation as a reward for their fidelity. While

according to all this there can be no doubt, that the book treated on the Jews in general, Josephus tells us in another passage, that Hecataeus not only mentions Abraham, but also wrote a book concerning him (*Antt.* i. 7. 2 = Euseb. *Praep. ev.* ix. 16 : *μνημονεύει δὲ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμου Βηρωσσός . . . Ἐκαταῖος δὲ καὶ τοῦ μνησθῆναι πλέον τι πεποίηκε βιβλίον γὰρ περὶ αὐτοῦ συνταξάμενος κατέλιπε*). Is this identical with the work on the Jews? To the decision of this question the two following pieces of testimony mainly contribute. (3) According to Clemens Alexandrinus, the spurious verses of Sophocles were contained in the work of Hecataeus *on Abraham and others* (Clem. Al. *Strom.* v. 14. 113 = Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 40 : *ὁ μὲν Σοφοκλῆς, ὡς φησιν Ἐκαταῖος ὁ τὰς ἱστορίας συνταξάμενος ἐν τῷ κατ' Ἀβραάμου καὶ τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους, ἄντικρυς ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐκβοᾷ*). (4) Origen says that Hecataeus in his work *on the Jews* was so strong a partisan for the Jewish people, that Herennius Philo (beginning of the second century after Christ)⁸³ at first doubted, in his work on the Jews, whether the work was indeed the production of Hecataeus the historian, but afterwards said that, if it were his, Hecataeus had been carried away by Jewish powers of persuasion, and had embraced their doctrines (Orig. *contra Cels.* i. 15 : *καὶ Ἐκαταίου δὲ τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ φέρεται περὶ Ἰουδαίων βιβλίον, ἐν ᾧ προστίθεται μᾶλλον πως ὡς σοφῷ τῷ ἔθνει ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον, ὡς καὶ Ἑρέννιον Φίλωναν ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἰουδαίων συγγράμματι πρῶτον μὲν ἀμφιβάλλειν, εἰ τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ ἐστὶ τὸ σύγγραμμα· δεύτερον δὲ λέγειν, ὅτι, εἴπερ ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ, εἰκὸς αὐτὸν συνηρπάσθαι ἀπὸ τῆς παρὰ Ἰουδαίους πιθανότητος καὶ συγκατατεθεῖσθαι αὐτῶν τῷ λόγῳ*). According to these testimonies of Clement and Origen, there can be no doubt that the work "*on the Jews*" was as much forged by a Jew as that "*on Abraham*." We cannot therefore conclude,—as according to the extracts in Josephus we might feel inclined,—that the work on the Jews is genuine, and

⁸³ On Herennius Philo or Philo Byblius, see Müller, *Fragm. hist. Graec.* 560 sqq.

that on Abraham spurious. The two are on the contrary very probably identical, and the different titles to be explained by the circumstance that the work was indeed entitled *περὶ Ἀβράμω*, but dealt in fact *περὶ Ἰουδαίων*.

Certain however as is, especially according to the information of Origen, the spuriousness of the work "on the Jews," it is still probable that it is founded on *genuine portions of Hecataeus*. In the extracts of Josephus we already get a partial impression of genuineness. To this is to be added, that Diodorus Siculus gives a long portion from Hecataeus on the Jews, their origin, religious rites, political constitution, manners and customs, which from its whole tenor is certainly not derived from the pseudo-Jewish Hecataeus, but from the real Hecataeus, and indeed not as Diodorus mistakenly states from Hecataeus of Miletus, but from Hecataeus of Abdera.⁸⁴ It is thus probable, that the latter in his Egyptian history went into details concerning the Jews, and that the Jewish counterfeiter thence derived a portion of his material.

The scanty fragments are not sufficient to give us a clear idea of the design of the whole work. Since it dealt in the first instance with Abraham, it is probable that the life and acts of that patriarch served as the point of departure for a general description and glorification of Judaism. In this the honourable history of the Jews (*e.g.* the favour shown them by Alexander the Great and Ptolemy Lagos), as well as the purity of their religious ideas, were referred to. In the description of the latter, the forged verses of the Greek poets would be inserted, for the purpose of proving that the nobler Greeks also were quite in harmony with the views of Judaism (see the preceding section). The work seems to have been tolerably extensive and to have contained much genuine as well as spurious material from the Greek poets. It thus became a mine for subsequent Jewish and Christian apologists.

⁸⁴ The passage of Diodorus here in question (from Book xl. of his larger work) has been preserved by Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* 244. See the wording also in Müller, *Fragm. hist. Græc.* ii. 391-393.

Its date of composition may be approximately determined. It is already cited by pseudo-Aristeas, who flourished not later than about 200 B.C. (see the next section). Thus pseudo-Hecataeus would have lived in the third century before Christ.

The fragments of both the real and the spurious Hecataeus of Abdera are collected in Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*, ii. 384–396. Comp. in general: Hecataei Abderitae, *philosophi et historici Eclogae sive fragmenta integri olim libri de historia et antiquitatibus sacris veterum Ebraeorum graece et latine cum notis Jos. Scaligeri et commentario perpetuo P. Zornii*, Altona 1730. Eichhorn's *Allg. Bibliothek der bibl. Literatur*, v. 1793, pp. 431–443. Creuzer, *Historicorum graec. antiquiss. fragm.* (Heidelb. 1806) pp. 28–38. Kanngiesser in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encykl.* sec. ii. vol. v. (1829) p. 38 sq. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, ii. 216–219. Cruice, *De Flavii Josephi in auctoribus contra Apionem afferendis fide et auctoritate* (Paris 1844), pp. 64–75. Vaillant, *De historicis, qui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere* (Paris 1851), pp. 59–71. Müller, *Fragm. hist. Graec. l.c.* Creuzer, *Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1853, pp. 70–72. Klein, *Jahrbh. für class. Philol.* vol. lxxxvii. 1863, p. 532. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 131 sqq., iv. 320 sq. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, pp. 165 sq., 178. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavii Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), p. 170 sqq.

5. Aristeas.

The celebrated Epistle of Aristeas to Philocrates on the translation of the Jewish law into Greek also belongs to the class of writings under consideration. The legend related forms only the external frame of the statement. The whole is in truth a *panegyric upon Jewish law, Jewish wisdom and the Jewish name in general from the mouth of a heathen*. The two individuals Aristeas and Philocrates are not known to history. Aristeas in the narrative gives himself out as an official of King Ptolemy II. Philadelphus, and as held in high esteem by that monarch (ed. Mor. Schmidt in *Merx' Archiv*, i. 261. 13–14 and 262. 8–10 = Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii.

2. 108). Philocrates was his brother (Merx' *Archiv*, i. 254. 10, 275. 20-21 = Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 104, 115), an earnest-minded man, eager for knowledge and desiring to appropriate all the means of culture which the age afforded. It is self-evident that both were not Jews (Aristeas says of the Jews, 255. 34-256. 2: τὸν γὰρ πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην θεὸν οὗτοι σέβονται, ὃν καὶ πάντες, ἡμεῖς δὲ μάλιστα προσο- νομάζοντες ἑτέρως Ζῆνα καὶ Δία). Aristeas then relates to his brother Philocrates—and indeed as one who was both an eye-witness and assistant—the manner in which the translation of the Jewish law into Greek took place. The librarian Demetrius Phalereus called the attention of King Ptolemy II. Philadelphus (for it is he who is intended, p. 255. 6 and 17) to the fact that the law of the Jews was yet lacking in his great library, and that its translation into Greek was desirable for the sake of its incorporation in the royal collection of books. The king obeyed this suggestion and presently sent Andreas, the captain of his body-guard, and Aristeas to Jerusalem, to Eleazar the Jewish high priest with rich presents, and with the request that he would send him experienced men capable of undertaking this difficult task. Eleazar was ready to fulfil the king's desire and sent him seventy-two Jewish scholars, six from each of the twelve tribes. Aristeas then gives a full description of the splendid presents sent on the occasion by Ptolemy to Eleazar, also a description of the town of Jerusalem, of the Jewish temple, the Jewish worship, nay, of the land, all which he had himself seen on the occasion of this embassy. The whole description has evidently the tendency of glorifying the Jewish people, with their excellent institutions and luxuriant prosperity. With the same purpose does Aristeas then communicate the purport of a conversation, he had carried on with the high priest Eleazar concerning the Jewish law. Aristeas was, by reason of this conversation, so much persuaded of the excellency of the Jewish law, that he held it necessary to explain to his brother Philocrates "its holi-

ness and its naturalness (reasonableness)" (283. 12-13: *τὴν σεμνότητα καὶ φυσικὴν διάνοιαν τοῦ νόμου προῆγμαί διασαφῆσαι σοι*). Especially are the folly of idolatry and the reasonableness of the Jewish laws of purity thoroughly treated of. When the Jewish scholars arrived at Alexandria, they were received with distinguished honours by the king and were for seven days invited day after day to the royal table. During these repasts the king continually addressed to the Jewish scholars in turn a multitude of questions on the most important matters of politics, ethics, philosophy and prudence, which they answered so excellently, that the king was full of admiration for the wisdom of these Jews. Aristeeas himself too, who was present at these repasts, could not contain himself for astonishment at the enormous wisdom of these men, who answered off-hand the most difficult questions, which with others usually require long consideration. After these festivities a splendid dwelling upon the island of Pharos, far from the tumult of the city, was allotted to the seventy-two interpreters, where they zealously set to work. Every day a portion of the translation was despatched in such wise, that by a comparison of what each had independently written, a harmonious common text was settled (306. 22-23: *οἱ δ' ἐπετέλουν ἕκαστα σύμφωνα ποιοῦντες πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ταῖς ἀντιβολαῖς*). The whole was in this manner completed in seventy-two days. When it was finished, the translation was first read to the assembled Jews, who acknowledged its accuracy with expressions of the highest praise. Then it was also read to the king, who "was much astonished at the intelligence of the lawgiver" (308. 8-9: *λίαν ἐξεθαύμασε τὴν τοῦ νομοθέτου διάνοιαν*), and commanded, that the books should be carefully preserved in his library. Lastly the seventy-two interpreters were dismissed to Judea, and rich presents for themselves and the high priest bestowed upon them.

This survey of the contents shows, that *the object of the narrative is by no means that of relating the history in the*

abstract, but the history so far as it shows, what esteem and admiration were felt for the Jewish law and for Judaism in general by even heathen authorities, such as King Ptolemy and his ambassador Aristeeas. For the tendency of the whole culminates in the circumstance, that praise was accorded to the Jewish law by *heathen* lips. The whole is therefore in the first place intended for *heathen* readers. They are to be shown what interest the learned Ptolemy, the promoter of science, felt in the Jewish law, and with what admiration his highly placed official Aristeeas spoke of it and of Judaism in general to his brother Philocrates. When then it is also remarked at the close, that the accuracy of the translation was acknowledged by the Jews also, this is not for the purpose of commending the translation to Jews, who might still oppose it, but to testify to the heathen, that they had in the present translation an accurate version of the genuine Jewish law, and it is *they*, the heathen, who are thus invited to read it.

No consensus concerning *the date* of this book has been arrived at by critics. It seems however tolerably certain to me, that it originated not later than about 200 years before Christ. The legend, that it was Demetrius Phalereus who suggested the whole undertaking to Ptolemy Philadelphus is unhistorical, not only in its details, but in the main point; for Demetrius Phalereus in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus no longer lived at court at Alexandria (see above, p. 161). When then the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus designates just Demetrius Phalereus as the originator of the undertaking (in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 2, see the passage above, p. 160), it is very probable that the book in question was already in his hands. Now Aristobulus lived in the time of Ptolemy Philometor, about 170–150 B.C., and the result thus obtained is supported on internal grounds also. The period when the Jewish people were leading a peaceful and prosperous existence under the conduct of their high priest and in a relation of very slight dependence upon Egypt, *i.e. the*

period before the conquest of Palestine by the Seleucidae, evidently forms the background of the narrative. There is nowhere any allusion to the complications and difficulties which begin with the Seleucidian conquest. The Jewish people and their high priest appear as almost politically independent. At all events it is to a time of peace and prosperity that we are transferred. Especially is it worthy of remark, that *the fortress of Jerusalem is in the possession of the Jews* (Merx' *Archiv*, i. 272. 10 to 273. 4 = Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 113). Whether this stood on the same spot as the one subsequently erected by Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc. i. 33) or not, the author is in any case acquainted with only the one in the possession of the Jews. The fortress however erected by Antiochus remained in the possession of the Seleucidae till the time of the high priest Simon (142–141 B.C., 1 Macc. xiii. 49–52). Of this fact the author has evidently as yet no knowledge, and as little of the subsequent princely position of the high priest; to him the high priest is simply the high priest, and not also prince or indeed king. In every respect then it is the circumstances of the Ptolemaic age that are presupposed. If the author has only artificially reproduced them, this is done with a certainty and a refinement which cannot be assumed in the case of a pseudonymous author living after it. Hence the opinion, that the book originated not later than 200 B.C., is justified.⁸⁵

The legend of this book has been willingly accepted and frequently related by Jews and Christians. The first who betrays an acquaintance with it is Aristobulus in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* xiii. 12. 2. The next is Philo, *Vita Mosis*, lib. ii. § 5–7

⁸⁵ It may also be mentioned, that Mendelssohn (*Jenaer Literaturzeitung*, 1875, No. 29) places the composition in the first half of the first century before Christ, because it is said of the Jewish land that it had "good harbours" (*ἀγαθὰς ἐνθαλάμους*), viz. Ascalon, Joppa, Gaza, Ptolemais (Merx' *Archiv*, 272. 23 sqq. = Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 114). This presupposed the union of these seaport towns with the Jewish land by Alexander Jannaeus. But Ascalon and Ptolemais were never united at all to the Jewish district, not even by Alexander Jannaeus. Hence the inference is inconclusive. The notion of Grätz, that pseudo-Aristeas wrote under Tiberius (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums*, 1876, pp. 289 sqq., 337 sqq.), is worth as much as many others of this scholar's fancies.

(ed. Mangey, ii. 138–141). Josephus reproduces, *Antt.* xii. 2, a great portion of this composition almost verbally. Comp. also *Antt. proem.* 3, *contra Apion.* ii. 4, *fin.* In rabbinic literature also are found some echoes, though quite confused ones, of this legend. See Lightfoot, *Opp.* ed. Roterod. ii. 934 sqq. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (1851), p. 25 sqq. Berliner, *Targum Onkelos* (1884), ii. 76 sqq.

The passages of the Fathers and Byzantines are most conveniently found collected (with full verbal correctness) in Gallandi, *Bibliotheca veterum patrum*, vol. ii. (Venetiis 1788) pp. 805–824. The legend is here reproduced with various modifications, especially the two following:—1. That the interpreters translated independently of each other and yet verbally coincided (the exact opposite of which is found in Aristeas, viz. that agreement was only obtained by comparison). 2. That not only the law but the entire Holy Scriptures were translated by the seventy-two (in Aristeas only the former is dealt with). See on the various forms of the legend: Eichhorn's *Repertorium für bibl. und morgenländ. Literatur*, i. (1777) p. 266 sqq., xiv. (1784) p. 39 sqq. The passages given in Gallandi are the following: Justin. *Apol.* i. 31. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 71. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohortatio ad Graec.* c. 13. Irenaeus, *adv. haer.* iii. 21. 2 (Greek in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* v. 8. 11 sqq.). Clemens Alex. *Strom.* i. 22. 148 sq. Tertullian. *Apologet.* c. 18. Anatolius in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 32. 16. Eusebius gives in his *Praeparatio evangelica*, viii. 2–5 and 9, large portions of the book of Aristeas verbatim; comp. also viii. 1. 8, ix. 38. *Chronic.* ed. Schoene, ii. 118 sq. (*ad ann. Abrah.* 1736). Cyrill. *Hieros. cateches.* iv. 34. Hilarius, *Pictav. prolog. ad librum psalmorum*. The same, *tractat. in psalmum* ii., *tractat. in psalmum cxviii.* Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus*, § 3, 6, 9–11 (fully and specially). Hieronymus, *Praefat. in version. Genes.* (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ix. 3 sq.). The same, *Praefat. in librum quaestion. hebraic.* (Vallarsi, iii. 303). Augustinus, *De civitate dei*, xviii. 42–43. Chrysostomus, *Orat.* i. *adversus Judaeos*. The same, *homil.* iv. *in Genes.* Theodoret, “*praefat. in psalmos.*” Pseudo-Athanasii *Synopsis scripturae sacrae*, c. 77. Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topograph. christ.* lib. xii. Joannes Malala, *Chronogr.* lib. viii. ed. Dindorf, p. 196. *Chronicon paschale*, ed. Dindorf, i. 326. Georgius Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 516–518. Georgius Cedrenus, ed. Bekker, i. 289 sq. Joannes Zonaras, *Annal.* iv. 16 (after Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 2). The five last-named are contained in the Bonn *Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae*.

On the manuscripts of this book of Aristeas, comp. Moriz Schmidt in Merx' *Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des alten Testaments*, i. 244 sqq.; and especially Lumbroso,

Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Égypte sous les Lagides (Turin 1870), p. 351 sqq. The latter specifies seven other manuscripts besides the two Parisian ones compared by Moriz Schmidt.

On the *editions* (and translations), see Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, iii. 660 sqq. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese*, vol. ii. (1798) p. 344 sqq. Moriz Schmidt's above-named work, p. 241 sqq. Lumbroso's above-named work, p. 359 sqq. The *editio princeps* of the Greek text was issued by Oporinus in Basle 1561. The book has since been often reprinted in Havercamp's edition of *Josephus* and elsewhere (ii. 2, pp. 103–132), and in Gallandi's *Bibliotheca patrum* (ii. 773–804). Much however remains to be done for the establishment of a critical text. Moriz Schmidt has taken a first step towards it by his edition in Merx' *Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des alten Testaments*, vol. i. (1869) pp. 241–312, for which two Parisian manuscripts were compared.

The older literature on Aristeas is specified by Rosenmüller as above, ii. 387–411; also in Fürst, *Biblioth. Jud.* i. 51–53. Comp. especially: Hody, *Contra historiam Aristee de LXX. interpretibus dissertatio*, Oxon. 1685. The same, *De biblionum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis et Latina vulgata*, Oxon. 1705 (in this larger work the earlier dissertation is reprinted and enriched with notes). Van Dale, *Dissertatio super Aristeae de LXX. interpretibus*, Amstelæd. 1705. Rosenmüller, *Handbuch für die Literatur der bibl. Kritik und Exegese*, vol. ii. (1798) pp. 358–386. Gfrörer, *Philo*, ii. 61–71. Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandr. Rel.-Philosophie*, ii. 205–215. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge der Juden*, p. 125. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, i. 263 sq., iii. 545–547. Frankel, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1858, pp. 237–250, 281–298. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 322 sqq. Hitzig, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, p. 338 sqq. Nöldeke, *Die alttestamentliche Literatur* (1868), pp. 109–116. Cobet in *Δόγμια Ἑρμῆς ἐκ τῶν Κόντων*, vol. i. (Leyden 1866) pp. 171 sqq., 177–181. Kurz, *Aristee epistula ad Philocratem*, Bern 1872 (comp. *Literar. Centralbl.* 1873, No. 4). Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, pp. 110–112, 124 sq., 141–143, 149 sq., 162–165, 203 sq. Grätz, "Die Abfassungszeit des Pseudo-Aristee" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1876, pp. 289 sqq., 337 sqq.). Papageorgios, *Ueber den Aristeas-brief*, München 1880 (comp. Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1881, p. 380 sq.). Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 515. The introductions to the Old Testament of Jahn, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Herbst, Scholz, Hävernick, De Wette-Schrader, Bleek, Keil, Reusch, Kaulen.

6. *Phocylides*.

Phocylides of Miletus, the old composer of apothegms, lived (according to the statements in Suidas, *Lex. s.v. Φωκυλίδης*, and Euseb. *Chron. ad Olymp.* 60, ed. Schoene, ii 98) in the sixth century before Christ. Few of his genuine sayings have been preserved. He must however have been held as an authority in the department of moral poetry. For in the Hellenistic period a didactic poem (ποίημα νουθετικόν) was interpolated in his work by a Jew (or Christian?) giving in 230 hexameters moral instruction of the most diversified kind. Having frequently been used as a school-book in the Byzantine period, it has been preserved in many manuscripts and often printed since the sixteenth century. The contents of these verses are almost exclusively ethical. It is but occasionally that we find the one true God and the future retribution also referred to. The moral doctrines, which the author inculcates, extend to the most various departments of practical life, somewhat in the manner of Jesus the son of Sirach. *In their details however they coincide most closely with the Old Testament, especially with the Pentateuch*, echoes of which are heard throughout in the precepts on civil relations (property, marriage, pauperism, etc.). Even such special precepts are found here as that which enjoins, that when a bird's nest is taken, only the young ones must be kept, but the mother let fly (Deut. xxii. 6, 7 = Phocylides, vers. 84-85), or that the flesh of animals killed by beasts of prey may not be eaten (Deut. xiv. 21; Ex. xxii. 30 = Phocylides, vers. 139, 147-148). There can thus be no doubt, that the author was either a Jew or a Christian. The former is the prevailing opinion since the fundamental investigation of Bernays; Harnack has recently advocated the latter.⁸⁶ Both

⁸⁶ In the notice of Bernays' "Gesammelten Abhandlungen" in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1885, p. 160. Harnack chiefly relies upon ver. 104, where it is said of the risen, that they "afterwards become gods" (ἐπίσω δι θεοί τιθήσονται). This is certainly a specifically Christian view, which Bernays gets rid of by changing θεοί into νείε.

views have their difficulties. For there is nothing in the work either specifically Jewish or specifically Christian. The author designedly ignores the Jewish ceremonial law, and even the Sabbath command, which is more striking here than in the Sibyllines, because the author in other respects enters into the details of the Mosaic law. On the other side there is no kind of reference to Christ, nor above all to any religious interposition for salvation. It is just bare morality which is here preached. Hence a *certain* decision as to the Jewish or Christian origin of the poem is scarcely possible. The scale against the Christian origin of the poem seems to me especially turned by the fact, that the author's moral teaching coincides only with the Old Testament and not with the moral legislation of Christ, as we have it in the synoptists. Of the latter there is in this poem, as far as I can see, no certain traces. And this is scarcely conceivable in a Christian author, who means to preach morality. If at the same time there are still single expressions or propositions in the poem, which betray a Christian hand (like *θεοί*, ver. 104), they must be set to the account of the Christian tradition, and how freely this dealt with the text is shown us by the portion, which by some chance or other got into the collection of the Sibyllines (*Sibyll.* ii. 56-148 = Phocylides, 5-79). The text as there presented diverges pretty much from that elsewhere handed down and plainly shows the hand of a Christian reviser.

If then this poem is of Jewish origin, it is of especial interest just through its lack of anything specifically Jewish. The design of the author is first of all to labour only for Jewish morality. He has not even the courage to speak strongly against idolatry. The two fundamental religious notions of Judaism, the unity of God and the future retribution, are indeed to be found in him also, and he indirectly advocates them. But he does it in so reticent a manner as to make it evident that morality occupies the first place in his regards. His Judaism is even paler than that of Philo.

For the *date of composition* no other limits can be laid

down than those which are given for Judæo-Hellenistic literature in general. It could not have appeared later than the first century after Christ, and in all probability considerably earlier. It might seem strange that it is not cited by Christian apologists, by a Clement or a Eusebius, who use so much else of this kind.⁸⁷ But the strangeness disappears as soon as we consider the object for which such quotations are made, viz. in the first place to produce heathen testimony to the *religious* ideas of Christianity, to the notions of the unity of God and the future retribution, and these were not expressed in Phocylides as forcibly as could be desired.

The most careful monograph on this poem is Bernays, *Ueber das Phokylideische Gedicht, ein Beitrag zur hellenistischen Litteratur*, Breslau 1856 (reprinted in Bernays, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, published by Usener, 1885, vol. i. pp. 191-261). The text of the poem with critical apparatus is best given in Bergk, *Poetae lyrici Graeci*, vol. ii. (3rd ed. 1866) pp. 450-475 (the same, pp. 445-449, also the fragment of the genuine Phocylides). Bernays as above gives the text according to his own recension. On the older editions, especially in the collections of gnomic writers, see Schier in his separate edition, Lips. 1751. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. Graec.* i. 704-749. Eckermann, art. "Phokylides," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allgem. Encyklopädie*, § 3, vol. xxiv. (1848) p. 485. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 96 sqq. The separate edition: Phocylidis, etc., *carmina cum selectis adnotationibus aliquot doct. virorum Graece et Latine, nunc denuo ad editiones praestantissimas rec. Schier*, Lips. 1751, must be brought forward. A German translation is given by Nickel, *Phokylides Mahngedicht in metrischer Uebersetzung*, Mainz 1833.

Comp. in general: Wachler, *De Pseudo-Phocylide*, Rinteln 1788. Rohde, *De veterum poetarum sapientia gnomica, Hebraeorum imprimis et Graecorum*, Havn. 1800. Bleek, *Theol. Zeitschr.*, edited by Schleiermacher, de Wette and Lücke, i. 1819, p. 185 (in the article on the Sibyllines). Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, ii. 222 sq. Eckermann, art. "Phokylides," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allg. Encyklop.* § 3, vol. xxiv. (1848) pp. 482-485. Teuffel in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* v. 1551. Alexandre's 1st ed. of the *Oracula Sibyllina*, ii. 401-409. Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griechischen*

⁸⁷ The first traces of its being used are found in Stobaeus and in certain classic scholia. See Bernhardt, *Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur*, ii. 1 (3rd ed. 1867), p. 520.

Litteratur, ii. 1 (3rd ed. 1867), pp. 517–523. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vi. 405, 412. Freudenthal, *Die Flavii Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft* (1869), p. 161 sqq. Leop. Schmidt's notice of Bernays' work in the *Jahrb. für class. Philol.* vol. lxxv. (1857) pp. 510–519. Goram, "De Pseudo-Phocylide" (*Philologus*, vol. xiv. 1859, pp. 91–112). Hart, "Die Pseudophokylideia und Theognis im codex Venetus Marcianus 522" (*Jahrb. für class. Philol.* vol. xcvi. 1868, pp. 331–336). Bergk, "Kritische Beiträge zu dem sog. Phokylides" (*Philologus*, vol. xli. 1882, pp. 577–601). Sitzler, "Zu den griechischen Elegikern" (*Jahrb. für class. Philol.* vol. cxxix. 1884, p. 48 sqq.). Phocylides, *Poem of Admonition*, with introd. and commentaries by Feuling, trans. by Goodwin, Andover, Mass. 1879. Still more literature in Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 96 sqq.; and in Engelmann's *Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum*, ed. Preuss.

7. *Smaller Pieces perhaps of Jewish Origin under Heathen Names.*

1. *Letters of Heraclitus?*—Epistolography was a favourite kind of literature in the later times of antiquity. The letters of eminent rhetoricians and philosophers were collected as a means of general culture. Letters were composed and also feigned under the names of famous persons, and generally for the purpose of furnishing entertaining and instructive reading. To the numerous species of the latter kind belong also nine supposed letters of Heraclitus, to which Bernays has devoted very thorough research. In two of them, the fourth and seventh, he thinks he can recognise the hand of "a believer in Scripture," and indeed in such wise, that the fourth is merely interpolated, but the seventh entirely composed by such an one. In fact the austere polemic against the worship of images in the fourth letter sounds quite Jewish or Christian, as does also the stern morality preached in the seventh, in which especially the partaking of "live" flesh, *i.e.* flesh with the blood, is denounced (τὰ ζῶντα κατεσθίετε; comp. on the Jewish and Christian prohibition, Acts xv. 29, and Div. ii. vol. ii. p. 318). It must however, as Bernays himself

acknowledges, remain a question, whether this "believer in the Scriptures" was a Jew or a Christian.

Bernays, *Die heraklitischen Briefe, ein Beitrag zur philosophischen und religionsgeschichtlichen Litteratur* (Berlin 1869), pp. 26 sqq., 72 sqq., 110 sq. Bernays gives also the text of the letters with a German translation. The latest edition of the *Epistolographi* in general is Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci recensuit*, etc., Paris, Didot, 1873. A separate edition of the letters of Heraclitus: Westermann, *Heracliti epist. quae feruntur*, Lips. 1857 (*Universitäts-progr.*). Comp. on the entire epistolographic literature, Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* i. 166-703. Nicolai, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, 2nd ed. ii. 2 (1877), p. 502 sqq.

2. *A letter of Diogenes?*—Among the fifty-one supposed letters of Diogenes, Bernays thinks that one, the twenty-eighth, may be referred to the same source as the seventh of Heraclitus. In fact it contains a similar moral sermon to the latter.

Bernays, *Lucian und die Kyniker* (Berlin 1879), pp. 96-98. See the text in all the editions of the *Epistolographi*, e.g. in Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci*, pp. 241-243.

3. *Hermippus?*—Hermippus Callimachus, who lived under Ptolemy III. and IV., and therefore in the second half of the third century before Christ, composed a large number of biographies of eminent persons. Among the pieces of information thence obtained, two arrest our attention. According to Origen, *contra Cels.* i. 15, it was said in the first book "on the lawgivers," that Pythagoras derived his philosophy from the Jews (*λέγεται δὲ καὶ Ἑρμιππον ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ περὶ νομοθετῶν ἱστορικέῃναι, Πυθαγόραν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φιλοσοφίαν ἀπὸ Ἰουδαίων εἰς Ἕλληνας ἀγαγεῖν*). According to Josephus, *contra Apion.* i. 22, a similar remark was contained in the first book "on Pythagoras." The notice of Josephus is however much more particular and accurate than that of Origen. For according to Josephus, Hermippus relates, that Pythagoras taught "not to go over a place where an ass had sunk on his

knees, to abstain from turbid water and to avoid all slander and blasphemy," and on this Hermippus then remarked: "Pythagoras did and taught these things, imitating and adopting the opinions of the Jews and Thracians" (ταῦτα δ' ἔπραττε καὶ ἔλεγε τὰς Ἰουδαίων καὶ Θρακῶν δόξας μιμούμενος καὶ μεταφέρων εἰς ἑαυτόν). Thus Hermippus did not denote the philosophy of Pythagoras as a whole, but only those special doctrines as borrowed from the Jews. For the words which follow in Josephus: λέγεται γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος πολλὰ τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις νομίμων εἰς τὴν αὐτοῦ μετενεγκεῖν φιλοσοφίαν, are no longer the words of Hermippus but of Josephus. In the reference of Josephus, the words of Hermippus contain nothing which he might not actually have written. It is otherwise with the reference of Origen. If this had been accurate we should have had to conclude, that a Jew had interpolated the work of Hermippus. But Origen himself intimates, that he had not seen the work of Hermippus; he says only: "Hermippus is said to have declared." It is most probable, that he is here relying solely on the passage of Josephus, which he reproduces but incorrectly. Thus we have here *not a Jewish forgery* but only an inaccurate reference of Origen to authenticate.

C. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iii. 35-54, has admitted both passages among genuine fragments of Hermippus (*Fr.* 2 and 21). Comp. for and against their genuineness: Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüd.-alex. Religionsphilosophie*, ii. 219 sq. Kellner, *De fragmentis Manethonianis* (1859), p. 42. Hilgenfeld, *Eintl. in das N. T.* p. 168, note. Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyh.* pp. 178, 192. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavii Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), p. 161 sqq.

4. *Numenius?*—The Pythagorean and Platonist Numenius (towards the end of the second century after Christ) as the genuine precursor of Neo-Platonism was acquainted with and after his fashion made use of the Jewish Scriptures, nay of Jewish tradition (*e.g.* concerning Jannes and Jambres, see above, p. 149). Origen bears decided testimony to this, when he says, *contra Cels.* iv. 51, that he knows that Numenius

quotes "in many passages of his works sayings of Moses and the prophets, and convincingly explains them in an allegorical manner, as *e.g.* in the so-called Epops, in the books on numbers and in those on space" (ἐγὼ δ' οἶδα καὶ Νουμήνιον . . . πολλαχοῦ τῶν συγγραμμάτων αὐτοῦ ἐκτιθέμενον τὰ Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ οὐκ ἀπιθάνως αὐτὰ τροπολογούντα, ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ καλουμένῳ Ἑποπι καὶ ἐν τοῖς "περὶ ἀριθμῶν" καὶ ἐν τοῖς "περὶ τόπου"). Comp. also Orig. *c. Cels.* i. 15; Zeller, *Philos. d. Griechen*, iii. 2. 217 sq. We have no reason to mistrust this testimony. It is not however credible, that Numenius should have used just this expression: τί γάρ ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωϋσῆς ἀττικίζων, which Clemens Alex. and others attribute to him.⁸⁸ If it really stood in a work of Numenius, it would certainly have to be laid to the account of a Jewish editor. We see however the real state of affairs from Eusebius, who only says, that this saying is ascribed to Numenius, viz. by oral tradition.⁸⁹ The saying then is *not a Jewish forgery*, but only an exaggeration due to oral tradition of the real view of Numenius.

Comp. on this question: Freudenthal, *Alex. Polyhistor*, p. 173, note. On Numenius in general: Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), pp. 216–223.

5. *Hermes Trismegistus*?—The god Hermes, and that as Trismegistus, was first represented as an author by the Egyptians. According to Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vi. 4. 37, there were forty-two books of Hermes, thirty-six of which contained the entire philosophy of the Egyptians, the other six were devoted to medicine. Tertullian, *de anima*, c. 2 and 33, is already acquainted with books of Mercurius Aegyptius, which taught a Platonizing psychology. From the latter circumstance it is seen, that the later Platonists especially had already taken posses-

⁸⁸ Clem. Alex. *Strom.* i. 22. 150. Hesychius Miles. in Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 171. Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Νουμήνιος.

⁸⁹ Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xi. 10. 14, ed. Gaisford: Εἰκότως δὲ τὰ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκείνο τὸ λόγιον περιφέρειται, δι' οὗ φάναι μνημονεύεται, τί γάρ ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωϋσῆς ἀττικίζων;

sion of this pseudonym. Thus then the works of Hermes, which have come down to us, are of Neo-Platonic origin. They are first cited by Lactantius, and were probably of the third century after Christ. Their position with respect to the heathen popular religions is a thoroughly positive one. "Just the defence of national and particularly of Egyptian religion is one of their chief objects" (Zeller, iii. 2. 234 sq.). But all the pieces are not the work of one author, nor are they even all of heathen origin. *Neither can the co-operation of Jewish hands in the production of this literature be proved.* On the contrary, what is not of heathen seems to be of Christian origin (c. 1 and 13 of the so-called Poemander).

Comp. on this whole literature: Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* i. 46-94. Bähr in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iii. 1209-1214. Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philosophie*, i. (4th ed. 1871) p. 256. Erdmann, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philos.* 3rd ed. 1878, vol. i. pp. 179-182. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), pp. 224-235. Erdmann and Zeller did not enter into a thorough description of the Hermes works till the more recent editions of their works as cited above.

§ 34. PHILO THE JEWISH PHILOSOPHER.

I. THE LIFE AND WRITINGS OF PHILO.

*The Literature.*¹

Mangey's edition of the works of Philo, the Prolegomena and especially the notes prefixed to the several works.

Fabricius, *Bibliotheca graeca*, ed. Harles, vol. iv. (1795) pp. 721-750.

Scheffer, *Quaestionum Philonianarum part. I. sive de ingenio moribusque Judaeorum per Ptolemaeorum saecula*, Marburgi 1829. Idem, *De usu Philonis in interpretatione Novi Testamenti*, Marburgi 1831.

Gfrörer, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie*, vol. i. (1831) pp. 1-113.

Creuzer, "Zur Kritik der Schriften des Juden Philo" (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1832, pp. 3-43).

Dähne, "Einige Bemerkungen über die Schriften des Juden Philo" (*Theol. Stud. und Krit.* 1833, pp. 984-1040). Idem, art. "Philon" in Ersch and Gruber's *Allg. Encyclopädie*, § 3, vol. xxiii. (1847) pp. 435-454.

Grossman, *De Philonis Judaei operum continua serie et ordine chronologico Comment.* Pts. i. ii. Lips. 1841-1842.

Steinhart, art. "Philo" in Pauly's *Real-Enc. der class. Alterthumswissensch.* vol. v. (1848) p. 1499 sq.

J. G. Müller, art. "Philo" in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xi. (1859) pp. 578-603. Idem, *Ueber die Texteskritik der Schriften des Juden Philo*, Basel 1839 (printed in J. G. Müller, *Des Juden Philo Buch von der Welterschöpfung*, 1841, pp. 17-45).

Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, 3rd ed. vol. vi. (1868) pp. 257-312.

Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Gesch. der Philosophie*, 4th ed. i. (1871) pp. 240-249.

¹ The literature here named refers only to Philo as an author in general. For the literature on Philo's doctrine, see No. II. below. For the literature on his several works, see in the places where they are treated of. Still more literature is given in: Fabricius, *Biblioth. graec.* ed. Harles, iv. 721 sqq. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 87-94. Engelmann, *Bibliotheca scriptorum classicorum* (8th ed. revised by Preuss), vol. i. 1880, pp. 546-548.

- Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. vol. ii. (1875) pp. 131-182.
- Delaunay, *Philon d'Alexandrie, écrits historiques, influence luttés et persécutions des juifs dans le monde romain*, 2nd ed. Paris 1870.
- Treitel, *De Philonis Judaei sermone*, Breal. 1872 (30 pp.).
- Siegfried, *Die hebräischen Worterklärungen des Philo und die Spuren ihrer Einwirkung auf die Kirchenväter* (37 pp. gr. 4), 1863. Idem, "Philonische Studien" (Merx's *Archiv für Erforschung des A. T.* ii. 2, 1872, pp. 143-163). Idem, "Philo und der überlieferte Text der LXX." (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1873, pp. 217 sqq., 411 sqq., 522 sqq.). Idem, *Zur Kritik der Schriften Philo's* (Ebendas. 1874, p. 562 sqq.).
- Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testaments an sich selbst und nach seinem geschichtlichen Einfluss betrachtet. Nebst Untersuchungen über die Grösstt Philo's*, Jena 1875.
- Nicolai, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, 2nd ed. ii. 2 (1877), pp. 653-659.
- Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iii. (3rd ed. 1878) pp. 678-683.
- Bernh. Ritter, *Philo und die Halacha, eine vergleichende Studie*, Leipzig 1879.
- Reuss, *Geschichte der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 566-568.
- Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, vol. ii. (1883) arta. "Philo" and "Religionsphilosophie."
- Zöckler, art. "Philo" in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xi. (1883) pp. 636-649.

Among Jewish Hellenists none other, besides Josephus, takes so eminent a position as Philo the Alexandrian. Even by reason of the extent of his works, which have been handed down, he is one of the most important *to us*. Of no other can we form even approximately, so clear a picture of his thoughts, and literary and philosophic labours. But he is also in himself evidently the most illustrious among all those, who strove to unite Jewish belief with Hellenic culture, to be the means of imparting to Jews the cultivation of the Greeks, and to Greeks the religious knowledge of the Jews. No other Jewish Hellenist was so fully saturated with the wisdom of the Greeks; no other enjoyed equal consideration in history. This is testified by the immense influence which he exercised upon after times and above all upon Christian theology the inheritor of the Judaeo-Hellenistic.²

² On the consideration enjoyed by Philo in antiquity, comp. especially Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 4. 3: *πλείστοις ἀνὴρ οὐ μόνον τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἔξωθεν ὁρμημάτων παιδείας ἐπιστημότατος.*

We have but a few scanty notices concerning his life. The assertion of Jerome, that he was of priestly race,³ has no support from older sources, nor does Eusebius know anything of it. According to Josephus⁴ he was a brother of the Alabarch Alexander, and consequently a member of one of the most aristocratic families of Alexandrian Jews.⁵ The sole event in his life, which can be chronologically fixed, is his participation in the embassy to Caligula in A.D. 40, of which he has himself furnished an account in the work *De Legatione ad Cajum*. As he was then of advanced age⁶ he may have been born about the year 20–10 B.C. The Christian legend, that he met St. Peter at Rome in the reign of Claudius, is of no historical value.⁷

Much has been lost of Philo's numerous works. But thanks to his being a favourite with the Fathers and Christian theologians the bulk of them has been preserved. Of the collective editions that of Mangey is, notwithstanding its deficiencies, the most valuable.⁸ Among recent contributions

³ *De viris illustribus*, c. 11 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 847): Philo Judaeus, natione Alexandrinus, de genere sacerdotum.

⁴ *Antt.* xviii. 8. 1.

⁵ Ewald (*Gesch.* vi. 259) and Zeller (*Philos. der Griechen*, 3rd ed. iii. 2. 339) have of late incorrectly rejected the statement of Josephus and declared Philo to have been the uncle of Alexander, because a nephew of Philo named Alexander is mentioned in the work published by Aucher, *De ratione animalium*, pp. 123 sq., 161 (in the 8th vol. of Ritter's edition). But it is nowhere said in it that this Alexander was the Alabarch.

⁶ He designates himself (*Legat. ad Cajum*, § 28, ed. Mangey, ii. 572) as φρονῖν τι δοκῶν περιττότερον καὶ δι' ἡλικίαν καὶ τὴν ἀλλήν παιδείαν. In the beginning of his work composed shortly after (§ 1, Mang. ii. 572) he calls himself γῆρων.

⁷ Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 17. 1. Hieronymus, *De viris illustr.* c. 11 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 847). Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 105. Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Φίλων (verbally according to the Greek translation of Jerome).

⁸ On the editions of Philo's works (or of separate parts) and of the translations, comp. Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* iv. 746–750. S. F. W. Hoffmann, *Lexicon bibliogr.* vol. iii. p. 231 sqq. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 87–92. Graesse, *Trésor de livres rares et précieux*, vol. v. (1864) pp. 269–271. The editio princeps is: Φίλωνος Ιουδαίου εἰς τὰ τοῦ Μωϋσέως κοσμοποιήματα, ιστορικά, νομοθετικά. Του αὐτου μονοβιβλια. Philonis Judaei in libros Mosis de mundi opificio, historicos, de legibus. Ejusdem libri singulares.

the works of Philo preserved only in Armenian, published by Aucher, are by far the most important.⁹ Greek portions of greater or less extent were given by Mai,¹⁰ Grossmann,¹¹ and

Ex bibliotheca regio, Parisiis, ex officina Adriana Turnebi, 1552 fol. Several publications of Höschel at first contributed to the completion of this very imperfect edition (Francof. 1587, Augustae Vindel. 1614). Collective editions appeared also at Geneva 1613 fol., Paris 1640 fol., Frankfort 1691 fol. (the Frankfort edition is only a reprint of the Parisian with identical paging). The edition of Mangey, 2 vols. London 1742 fol., marks an important advance. It is the first which is based upon a more extensive comparison of the manuscripts and is also more complete than any former one. The edition of Pfeiffer, vols. i.-v. Erlangen 1785-1792, 2nd ed. 1820, remained unfinished (it contains only what stands in Mangey vols. i. and ii. 1-40). On the deficiencies in the editions of Mangey and Pfeiffer, see Creuzer, *Stud. und Krit.* 1832, pp. 5-17. J. G. Müller, *Ueber die Texteskritik der Schriften des Juden Philo*, Basel 1839, p. 5 sqq. (printed in J. G. Müller, *Des Juden Philo Buch von der Welterschöpfung*, 1841, p. 18 sqq.).

⁹ They appeared in two vols. under separate titles: (1) *Philonis Judaei sermones tres hactenus inediti, i. et ii. de providentia et iii. de animalibus, ex Armino versione etc. nunc primum in Latium [sic] fideliter translati per Jo. Bapt. Aucher, Venetiis 1822.* (2) *Philonis Judaei paralipomena Armena, libri videlicet quatuor in Genesin, libri duo in Exodum, sermo unus de Sampson, alter de Jona, tertius de tribus angelis Abraamo apparentibus, opera hactenus inedita ex Armena versione etc. nunc primum in Latium fideliter translata per Jo. Bapt. Aucher, Venetiis 1826.*

¹⁰ The works here in question are: (1) *Philo et Virgilii interpretes. In it Philonis Judaei de cophini festo et de colendis parentibus cum brevi scripto de Jona, editore ac interprete Angelo Maio, Mediolan. 1818.* (2) *Classicorum auctorum e Vaticanis codicibus editorum*, vol. iv. curante Angelo Maio, Romae 1831 (contains: pp. 402-407, *Philonis de cophini festo*; pp. 408-429, *Philonis de honorandis parentibus*; pp. 430-441, *Philonus ex opere in Exodum selectae questiones*). (3) *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio e Vaticanis codicibus*, edita ab Angelo Maio, vol. vii. Romae 1833 (contains, Pt. I. pp. 74-109, specimens from a Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes with numerous smaller fragments of Philo). (4) *Philonis Judaei, Porphyrii philosophi, Eusebii Pamphili opera inedita.* In it: *Philonis Judaei de virtute ejusque partibus*, ed. Ang. Maius, Mediolan. 1816 (this work, which in the Milan manuscript used by Mai bears the name of Philo, is in other manuscripts attributed to Gemistus Pletho, and was long printed under his name, as Mai himself subsequently remarked). See *Leipziger Literaturzeitung*, 1818, No. 276.

¹¹ Grossmann, *Anecdoton Graecum Philonis Judaei de Cherubinis Exod.* xxv. 18, Lips. 1856 (this supposed *Anecdoton* from the *cod. Vat.* n. 379 was already printed in the year 1831 in Mai, *Classicorum auctorum*, vol. iv. pp. 430-441. Tischendorf indeed knew nothing of it in 1863, comp. his *Philonea*, p. xix. sq.).

Tischendorf.¹³ Pitra has communicated material of various kinds from manuscripts.^{13a} In the more recent hand editions these publications have been at least partially turned to account.¹³ A satisfactory collective edition is however as yet wanting. That planned long since by Grossmann has not been carried into execution.¹⁴ For a new edition, a careful investigation also of the material offered by the as yet un-

¹³ Tischendorf, *Anecdota sacra et profana* (2nd ed. Lips. 1861), pp. 171-174. But especially Tischendorf, *Philonea, inedita altera, altera nunc demum recte ex vetere scriptura eruta*, Lips. 1868. Holwerda in the *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der koninkl. Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde, tweede reeks derde deel*, Amsterdam 1873, pp. 271-288, gives emendations of Tischendorf's text. Idem, *Derde reeks eerste deel*, 1884, pp. 274-286.

^{13a} Pitra, *Analecta sacra spicilegio Solesmensi parata*, vol. ii. (1884) pp. xxii. sq., 304-334. Pitra here gives: (1) Philo-fragments from the Florilegium of the *codex Coislinianus* 276 (pp. 304-310). (2) Philo-fragments from various Vatican MSS. (pp. 310-314). (3) A list of the Philo-manuscripts in the Vatican Library, together with a list of the several works of Philo contained in these manuscripts (pp. 314-319). (4) Information concerning various ancient and modern Latin translations of Philo (pp. 319-334).

¹³ The hand edition of Richter (8 vols. Lips. 1828-1830) contains besides the text of Mangey the two publications of Aucher and those of Mai of the year 1818. The same texts are also in the Tauchnitz stereotype edition (8 vols. Lips. 1851-1853). On recent editions of separate works of Philo (*De opificio mundi*, by J. G. Müller, *De incorruptibilitate mundi*, by Bernays), see below at the proper places. I may also mention that a number of Philo's writings translated into German will be found in the *Bibliothek der griechischen und römischen Schriftsteller über Judenthum und Juden in neuen Uebersetzungen und Sammlungen*, vol. i. Leipzig 1865 [vol. ii. contains *Josephus*], vol. iii. 1870, vol. iv. 1872.

¹⁴ Grossmann publicly expressed his intention so long ago as 1829 (*Quaestiones Philoneae*, i. p. 7). Afterwards Tischendorf in particular collected materials for him, comp. *Anecdota sacra et profana*, p. 171: *Quam Grossmannus longissimo ex tempore novam operum scriptoris istius gravissimi editionem praeparat, ea ex collationibus meis codicum fere triginta ubique terrarum dispersorum non modo apparatus habebit locupletissimum et textum prioribus editionibus multo correctiorem, verum etiam aucta erit ineditis nonnullis quae in Italia reperire mihi contigit*. On the *manuscripts* of Philo, comp. the Prolegomena in Mangey's edition, Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* iv. 743-746. Tischendorf, *Philonea*, pp. vii.-xx. Some notices in Mai, *Nova patrum bibliotheca*, vi. 2, p. 67, note. A list of the Vatican manuscripts in Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. p. 314, and at pp. 316-319, accurate information as to the manuscripts in which each separate work of Philo is contained.

printed Florilegia (collections of extracts from the Fathers and more ancient authors) would be necessary.¹⁵

A tolerably complete catalogue of Philo's works is already given by Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History.¹⁶ Unfortunately however it is in such disorder as to afford no foothold for the correct classification of the works. In this respect we are almost exclusively referred to the contents

¹⁵ The best known among the extant printed Christian Florilegia are those of Maximus Confessor, Johannes Damascenus and Antonius Melissa. In all three Philo is frequently quoted (see the indexes in Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* ix. pp. 663, 731, 756). To the same category belong also the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes in Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio*, vii. 1. 74-109. Mangey has collected from Johannes Damascenus (*Sacra parallela*) and Antonius Melissa all those passages which are derived from lost works of Philo (*Philonis opp.* ii. 648-660, 670-674). But what Mangey here gives under the name of Johannes Damascenus really comes from two different collections. For Lequien gives in his edition of Johannes Damascenus first (ii. 274-730) the complete text of the *Sacra parallela*, but then also (ii. 730-790) a selection of passages from another and considerably divergent recension of the *sacra parallela*, which is also attributed to Johannes Damascenus. The latter (in a *codex Ruffecaldinus* of the Jesuit College, Paris) seems to me however exactly identical with the so-called *Johannes Monachus ineditus*, extracts of which from lost works of Philo are given by Mangey himself after the supposed extracts from Johannes Damascenus (*Philonis opp.* ii. 660-670). For both manuscripts belong to the Jesuit College at Paris and have exactly the same superscription (Lequien, ii. 274 sq., 731; Mangey, i. p. xviii. sq. and ii. 660). Seeing the importance of the so-called *Johannes Monachus ineditus* in the criticism of Philo, the matter deserved a more accurate investigation. Pitra (*Analecta sacra*, ii. 304-310) has given various fragments from Philo from a third recension of the *Sacra parallela* in the *cod. Coislinianus* 276. Many similar collections of extracts moreover exist in manuscript, which have not as yet been turned to any account with respect to Philo. See Fabricius-Harles, *Bibl. gr.* ix. 720 sq., 758 sq. Comp. on this literature in general: Fabricius-Harles, ix. 635-759. Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* vol. iii. 1878, pp. 309-318. Wachsmuth, *Studien zu den griechischen Florilegien*, Berlin 1882. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentl. Kanons*, Pt. iii. (1884) pp. 7-10.

¹⁶ Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 18. The statements of Jerome, *De viris illustr.* c. 11 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 847 sq.), rest entirely upon this catalogue of Eusebius. Again the catalogue in Suidas (*Lex. s.v. Φίλων*) is copied with only a few additions of his own from the Greek translation of Jerome. Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 103, 104, 105 on the other hand gives somewhat that is independent. Comp. in general the *testimonia veterum* in Mangey, i. pp. xxi.-xxix. The long fragments from different works of Philo in the *Praep. evang.* of Eusebius are also especially valuable.

of the works themselves, a careful consideration of which evidently shows, that they by no means form so unconnected a mass, as appears from the titles in the editions. The great majority are on the contrary only sub-divisions of some few large works. And indeed, as especially Ewald has correctly perceived, *three chief works on the Pentateuch* may be distinguished, which alone embrace more than three-quarters of what has come down to us as Philo's.¹⁷

I. The *Ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*, *Quaestiones et solutiones*, which first became more widely known through the publications of Aucher from the Armenian, are a comparatively brief *catechetical explanation of the Pentateuch in the form of questions and answers*. It is not easy to ascertain how far they extended. In the time of Eusebius, they were extant for only Genesis and Exodus (*H. E.* ii. 18. 1 and 5) and such other traces as may be regarded as certain extend only to these two books.¹⁸ The explanation of Genesis comprised probably *six books*, at all events only so much can be certainly pointed out from the quotations.¹⁹ The explanation of *Exodus* comprised, according to the testimony of Eusebius (*H. E.* ii. 18. 5) and Jerome, *five books*.

¹⁷ More or less valuable contributions to the correct classification of Philo's works have been furnished by Mangey, Fabricius, Gfrörer, Dähne, Grossmann, Ewald and Siegfried in the above-named works and articles (Siegfried in the *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1874, p. 562 sqq.). The arbitrarily got up surveys of J. G. Müller and Zöckler are on the contrary useless. Steinhart and Hamburger are also inaccurate. Hausrath, ii. 152–154, does the most for confusion.

¹⁸ Grossmann (*De Phil. Jud. operum continua serie*, i. p. 25) and Ewald (*Gesch.* vi. 294 sq.) suppose, that the work extended to the three last books of the Pentateuch also. In Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio*, vii. 1, p. 104^a, is indeed found a fragment *ἐκ τῶν ἐν τῇ λειψιδικῇ ζητημάτων*. But sometimes errors occur in these quotation formulae also.

¹⁹ Three fragments *ἐκ τοῦ ε' τῶν ἐν γένεσι ζητημάτων* (Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio*, vii. 1, pp. 100^b, 106^b, 108^b), occur in the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes. In Le Quien's edition of Johannes Damascenus, ii. 362, note, it is remarked, that a fragment there given is introduced in the *cod. Rupefucaldinus* (see above, note 15) by the formula *ἐκ τοῦ ε' τῶν αὐτῶν* (*scil. τῶν ἐν γένεσι ζητουμένων*). All other known quotations refer to Books i.–v. Only once in Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1. 99^b, is found *ἐκ τοῦ θ' τῶν ἐν γένεσι ζητημάτων*, where however E must certainly be read for Θ.

Of these are preserved (1) in the *Armenian* tongue about the half of these eleven books, viz. four on Genesis (incomplete) and two on Exodus (also imperfect);²⁰ and (2) a large fragment (comprising about half of the fourth book on Genesis) in an old *Latin* translation, which was repeatedly printed in the beginning of the sixteenth century, but entirely ignored by the publishers of the Greek works.²¹ Lastly (3) in *Greek* numerous small fragments still awaiting collection.²² By the

²⁰ Published in Armenian and Latin by Aucher, 1826 (see above, note 9). After this in Latin also in Richter, *Philonis opp.* 6 and 7 vols., and in the Tauchnitz stereotype edition (also in 6 and 7 vols.). On the gaps, comp. Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, p. 1038.

²¹ *Philonis Judaei centum et duae quaestiones et totidem responsiones super Genesim*, Paris 1520, fol. (Fabricius-Harles, iv. 746). The Giessen University library possesses: *Philonis Judaei Alexandrini, libri antiquitatum, quaestionum et solutionum in Genesim, de Essaeis, de nominibus Hebraicis, de mundo*, Basileae 1527, fol. (in which, pp. 61–83: Philonis Judaei quaestionum et solutionum in Genesim liber). There are also impressions of 1538 and 1550 (Fabricius, l.c.). Aucher, pp. 362–443 (under the Armenio-Latin text), and Richter, vii. 212–261, follow the impression of 1538. Manuscripts also of this Latin text are still known, two Vatican (Vatican 488 and Urbin 61) and one Laurentianus; see thereon Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. 298 sq., 314, 332. On the age and character of the translation, Pitra, *Analecta*, ii. 298 sq., 319 sqq.

²² Of *Greek* fragments are known: (1) A small piece: *ἐκ τοῦ πρώτου τῶν Φίλωνος Ζητημάτων καὶ λύσεων*, on Genesis in Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* vii. 13. (2) The fragment *De Cherubinis* on Exodus, published by Mai, Grossmann and Tischendorf (Mai, *Classicorum auctororum*, vol. iv. pp. 430–441; Grossmann, *Anecdota*, etc. 1856; Tischendorf, *Philonea*, pp. 144–153). (3) Numerous small fragments from Johannes Damascenus, *Johannes Monachus ineditus*, Antonius Melissa and the Catena of the cod. Paris, Reg. n. 1825, in Mangey, *Philonis opp.* ii. 648–680. Of these certainly it is only the fragments in the *codex Rupefucaldinus* and in *Johannes Monachus ineditus*, Mang. ii. 653–670 (both probably identical, see above, note 15), that are expressly traced to the *ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*. But many others, especially those in the Catena, come from it. (4) About thirty to forty small fragments in the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes, in Mai, *Script. vet. nova collectio*, vii. 1. 96–109. (5) A portion also of the small fragments edited by Tischendorf (*Anecdota sacra et profana*, pp. 171–174; *Philonea*, pp. 152–155) are probably derived from this work. (6) Six small fragments in the Florilegium of the *codex Coislunianus* in Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. 307 sq. Various other fragments from Vatican manuscripts also in Pitra, *Analecta*, ii. 310–314 (a portion at least of these fragments must certainly be included). (7) A more accurate investigation of the Florilegia,

help of the Armenian text it is now settled, that many passages have been taken almost verbally from this work, without mention of Philo's name, by the Fathers and especially by Ambrose.²³ The composition of these *Quaestiones et solutiones* is in some parts of earlier in other of later date, than that of the large allegorical commentary, as is shown by the allusions to each other in both works.²⁴

II. While this shorter explanation in a catechetical form was intended for more extensive circles, Philo's special and chief scientific work is his *large allegorical commentary on Genesis*, *Νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι* (such is the title given it in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 18. 1, and Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 103. Comp. also Origen, *Comment. in Matth.* vol. xvii. c. 17; *contra Celsum*, iv. 51).²⁵ These two works frequently approximate each other as to their contents. For in the *Quaestiones et solutiones* also, the deeper allegorical signification is given as well as the literal meaning. In the great allegorical commentary on the contrary, the allegorical interpretation exclusively prevails. The deeper allegorical sense of the sacred letter is settled in extensive and prolix discussion, which by reason of the copious adducting of parallel passages often seems to wander from the text. Thus the entire exegetic method, with its dragging in of the most hetero-

especially of those not as yet edited (see note 15), would furnish considerable gain in the matter of small fragments.

²³ Numerous passages from Ambrose are reprinted in Aucher under the Armenio-Latin text. Comp. on the use of Philo by Ambrose generally: Siegfried, *Philo*, pp. 371-391. Förster, *Ambrosius Bischof von Mailand* (1884), pp. 102-112.

²⁴ Ewald (*Gesch.* vi. 294) regards the *Quaestiones et solutiones* as older than the large allegorical commentary. Dähne (*Stud. und Krit.* 1833, p. 1087) considers it more recent. For a more minute discussion, see Grossmann, *De Phil. Jud. operum continua serie*, ii. pp. 14-17.

²⁵ In the quotations in the *Florilegia ἀλληγορία* is always in the singular, e.g. in *Johannes Monachus ineditus* ἐκ τοῦ α' τῆς νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας, ἐκ τοῦ δ' τῆς νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας (both in Mangey, ii. 668). So too in the *Florilegium* of the *codex Coislinianus* (Pitra, *Analecta sacra*), ii. 306, and in that of Leontius and Johannes (Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, pp. 95^b, 96^a, 98^b, 99^b, 100^a, 102^a, 105^a, 107^a, 107^b).

geneous passages in elucidation of the idea supposed to exist in the text, forcibly recalls the method of Rabbinical Midrash. This allegorical interpretation however has with all its arbitrariness, its rules and laws, the allegorical meaning as once settled for certain persons, objects and events being afterwards adhered to with tolerable consistency. Especially is it a *fundamental thought*, from which the exposition is everywhere deduced, *that the history of mankind as related in Genesis is in reality nothing else than a system of psychology and ethic*. The different individuals, who here make their appearance, denote the different states of soul (τρόποι τῆς ψυχῆς) which occur among men. To analyse these in their variety and their relations both to each other and to the Deity and the world of sense, and thence to deduce moral doctrines, is the special aim of this great allegorical commentary. Thus we perceive at the same time, that Philo's chief interest is *not*—as might from the whole plan of his system be supposed—speculative theology for its own sake, but on the contrary psychology and ethic. To judge from his ultimate purpose he is not a speculative theologian, but a psychologist and moralist (comp. note 183).

The commentary at first follows the text of Genesis verse by verse. Afterwards single sections are selected, and some of them so fully treated, as to grow into regular monographs. Thus *e.g.* Philo takes occasion from the history of Noah to write two books on drunkenness (περὶ μέθης), which he does with such thoroughness, that a collection of the opinions of other philosophers on this subject filled the first of these lost books (Mangey, i. 357).

The work, as we have it, begins at Gen. ii. 1: *Καὶ ἐτελέσθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ*. The creation of the world is therefore not treated of. For the composition, *De opificio mundi*, which precedes it in our editions, is a work of an entirely different character, being no allegorical commentary on the history of the creation, but a statement of that history itself. Nor does the first book of the *Legum allegoriarum* by

any means join on to the work *De opificio mundi*; for the former begins at Gen. ii. 1, while in *De opif. mundi*, the creation of *man* also, according to Gen. ii., is already dealt with. Hence—as Gfrörer rightly asserts in answer to Dähne—the allegorical commentary cannot be combined with *De opif. mundi* as though the two were but parts of the same work. At most may the question be raised, whether Philo did not also write an allegorical commentary on Gen. i. This is however improbable. For the allegorical commentary proposes to treat of the history of *mankind*, and this does not begin till Gen. ii. 1. Nor need the abrupt commencement of *Leg. alleg.* i. seem strange, since this manner of starting at once with the text to be expounded, quite corresponds with the method of Rabbinical Midrash. The later books too of Philo's own commentary begin in fact in the same abrupt manner. In our manuscripts and editions only the first books bear the title belonging to the whole work, *Νόμων ιερῶν ἀλληγορίαι*. All the later books have special titles, a circumstance which gives the appearance of their being independent works. In truth however *all that is contained in Mangey's first vol.*—viz. the works which here follow—belongs to the book in question (with the sole exception of *De opificio mundi*).

1. *Νόμων ιερῶν ἀλληγορίαι πρῶται τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον. Legum allegoriarum liber i.* (Mangey, i. 43–65). On Gen. ii. 1–17.—*Νόμων ιερῶν ἀλληγορίαι δευτέραι τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον. Legum allegoriarum liber ii.* (Mangey, i. 66–86). On Gen. ii. 18–iii. 1^a. — *Νόμων ιερῶν ἀλληγορίαι τρίται τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἑξαήμερον. Legum allegoriarum liber iii.* (Mangey, i. 87–137). On Gen. iii. 8^b–19.—The titles here given of the first three books, as customary in the editions since Mangey,²⁶ require an important correction. Even the different extent of Books i. and ii. leads us to conjecture, that they may properly be but *one* book. In fact Mangey remarks

²⁶ I do not give the Latin titles exactly according to Mangey, but as they are usually quoted.

at the commencement of the third book (i. 87, note): in omnibus codicibus opusculum hoc inscribitur *ἀλληγορία δευτέρα*. Thus we have in fact but two books. There is however a gap between the two, the commentary on Gen. iii. 1^b-8^a being absent. The commentary too on Gen. iii. 20-23 is wanting, for the following book begins with Gen. iii. 24. As Philo in these first books follows the text step by step, it must be assumed, that each of the two pieces was worked up into a book by itself, and this is even certain with respect to the second.²⁷ Hence the original condition was very probably as follows: Book i. on Gen. ii. 1-3, 1^a, Book ii. on Gen. iii. 1^b-3, 8^a, Book iii. on Gen. iii. 8^b-19, Book iv. on Gen. iii. 20-23. With this coincides the fact, that in the so-called *Johannes Monachus ineditus*, the commentary on Gen. iii. 8^b-19 is indeed more often quoted as τὸ γ' τῆς τῶν νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας (Mangey, i. 87, note). When on the other hand the same book is entitled in the MSS. *ἀλληγορία δευτέρα*, this must certainly be explained as showing that the actual second book was already missing in the archetype of these manuscripts.

2. *Περὶ τῶν Χερουβὶμ καὶ τῆς φλογίνης ῥομφαίας καὶ τοῦ κτισθέντος πρώτου ἐξ ἀνθρώπου Κάιν. De Cherubim et flammeo gladio* (Mangey, i. 138-162). On Gen. iii. 24 and iv. 1. From this point onwards the several books have been handed down no longer under the general title *νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι*, but under special titles. According to our conjecture as above, this book would be the *fifth*, unless it formed the *fourth* together with the commentary on Gen. iii. 20-23.

3. *Περὶ ὧν ἱερουργοῦσιν Ἀβελ τε καὶ Κάιν. De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* (Mangey, i. 163-190). On Gen. iv. 2-4. In the *codex Vaticanus* the title runs: *Περὶ γενέσεως Ἀβελ καὶ*

²⁷ The remark in *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, § 12. *fin.* (i. 171, Mang.): τί δέ ἐστι τὸ τῆν γῆν ἐργάζεσθαι, διὰ τῶν προτέρων βίβλων ἰδηλώσαμεν, can refer only to the missing commentary on Gen. iii. 23. Comp. Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1863, p. 1015. Grossmann indeed (i. p. 22) thinks it relates to the book *De agricultura*, which was certainly a later composition.

ὦν αὐτὸς καὶ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ Κάιν ἱεουργοῦσιν. Frequently quoted in *Johannes Monachus ineditus* with the formula 'Εκ τοῦ περὶ γενέσεως Ἀβελ (see Mangey, i. 163, note). Also in the Florilegium of the *codex Coislinianus*.²⁷ The missing commentary on Gen. iv. 5-7 would have formed either the conclusion of this book, or a separate book.

4. Περὶ τοῦ τὸ χεῖρον τῷ κρείττονι φιλεῖν ἐπιτίθεσθαι. *Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat* (Mangey, i. 191-225). On Gen. iv. 8-15. The book is already quoted by Origen under this special title (*Comm. in Matth.* vol. xv. c. 3). Eusebius mistakenly quotes under the same title several passages belonging to *De confusione linguarum* (*Praep. Ev.* xi. 15). In the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes several passages are cited from our book with the formula ἐκ τοῦ ζ καὶ η τῆς νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας.²⁸ Also in *Johannes Monachus ineditus* (Mangey, i. 191, note). The unusual formula ἐκ τοῦ ζ καὶ η must surely mean, that the seventh book was according to another computation also called the eighth (ἐκ τοῦ ζ τοῦ καὶ η would thus be the more accurate).²⁹ This book then is according to the usual numbering the seventh, but was, in consequence of *De opificio mundi* being placed first, also called the eighth.

5. Περὶ τῶν τοῦ δοκησισόφου Κάιν ἐγγόνων καὶ ὡς μεταβάσκειν γίνεται. *De posteritate Caini sibi visi sapientis et quo pacto sedem mutat* (Mangey, i. 226-261). On Gen. iv. 16-25. This book was first published by Mangey from the *cod. Vat.* 381. Much more correctly from the same manuscript by

²⁷ Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. 308 sq.

²⁸ The following passages are cited with this formula: 1. Κυρίως οὗτοι ἐπὶ χρημάτων ἢ κτημάτων περιουσίᾳ οὗτοι ἐπὶ δόξης λαμπρότητι κ.τ.λ. Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 96^a = Mangey, i. 217, *med.* 2. Ἐν ᾧ μὲν ψυχῇ τὸ ἐκτὸς αἰσθητὸν ὡς μέγιστον ἀγαθὸν τιμῶνται, ἐν ταύτῃ λόγος ἀσώτῳ οὐκ εὐρίσκεται κ.τ.λ. Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 107^a = Mangey, i. 192, *init.* The same formula is also found 3. *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 102^a (where of course ζ καὶ η must be read for ζ καὶ ιγ); and 4. The same, p. 107b. The former passage is in the beginning of *De posteritate Caini* (Mang. i. 228); I have not succeeded in discovering the latter.

²⁹ Comp. Dähne, *Stud. und Kritik*. 1893, p. 1015.

Tischendorf, *Philonea*, pp. 84–143. Holwerda gave emendations in 1884 (see note 12 above). This book is in like manner as the former quoted with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ η καὶ θ τῆς νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας* in Leontius and Johannes,³⁰ in the Florilegium of the *codex Coislinianus*,^{30a} and in *Johannes Monachus ineditus* (Mangey, i. 226, note).

Of these books none is mentioned by its special title in the catalogue of Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* ii. 18, while all that follow are quoted under these titles, evidently because Eusebius considers the former to be included and the latter not included in the joint title *νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι*. To this must be added, that in the Florilegia also, the quotations under the general title extend exactly thus far. *It is therefore highly probable, that Philo issued the following books only under the special titles.*³¹ Nay, it is also evident why this was done, viz. *because from this point onwards the uninterrupted text was no longer commented on, but only selected passages.* The exegetic method is however quite the same in the following books.

6. *Περὶ γιγάντων*. *De gigantibus* (Mangey, i. 262–272). On Gen. vi. 1–4.—*Ὅτι ἄτρεπτον τὸ θεῖον. Quod deus sit immutabilis* (Mangey, i. 272–299). On Gen. vi. 4–12. These two paragraphs, which are in our editions separated, form together but *one* book. Hence Johannes Monachus ineditus cites passages from the latter paragraph with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ περὶ γιγάντων* (Mangey, i. 262, note, 272, note).

³⁰ Two passages: 1. Παιδείας σύμβολον ἢ ῥάβδος ἀνεν γὰρ τοῦ δυναπῆναι (sic) καὶ περὶ ἰνίων ἐπιπληχθῆναι, νοθεύειν ἐνδείξασθαι καὶ σωφρονισμὸν, αἰμώχμον κ.τ.λ. Mai, *Script. vel. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 99^b = Mangey, i. 243.—2. Πίσφυς ὁ ἄφρων ἐπὶ μηδενὸς ἰστένας παγίως καὶ ἐνερσίᾳ δόγματος ἄλλοτε γοῦν ἄλλοιᾳ δοξάζει . . . Καὶ ἴστω αὐτῷ πᾶσα ἡ ζωὴ κρεμαμένη βάσει ἀεράδαντων οὐκ ἔχουσα κ.τ.λ. Mai, *Script. vel. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 100 = Mangey, i. 230–231.

^{30a} Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, vol. ii. (1884) p. 306. The two passages here given by Pitra are in Mangey, i. 230 above and 253 (*de posteritate Caini*, § 6 and 43).

³¹ In answer to Dähne, *Stud. und Kritik*. 1833, pp. 1019–1024. Ersch and Grüber's *Enc.*, art. "Philo," p. 442.

Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 4: *περὶ γιγάντων ἢ* [elsewhere *καὶ*] *περὶ τοῦ μὴ τρέπεσθαι τὸ θείον.*

7. *Περὶ γεωργίας.* *De agricultura* (Mangey, i. 300–328). On Gen. ix. 20^a.—*Περὶ φυτουργίας Νῶε τὸ δεύτερον.* *De plantatione Noe* (Mangey, i. 329–356). On Gen. ix. 20^b. The common title of these two books is properly *περὶ γεωργίας*. Comp. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ γεωργίας δύο.* Hieronymus, *De vir. illustr.* 11: *de agricultura duo.* Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* vii. 13. 3 (ed. Gaisford): *ἐν τῷ περὶ γεωργίας προτέρῳ.* *Ibid.* vii. 13. 4: *ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ.*

8. *Περὶ μέθης.* *De ebrietate* (Mangey, i. 357–391). On Gen. ix. 21. From the beginning of this book it is evident that another book preceded it, in which *τὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις φιλοσόφοις εἰρημένα περὶ μέθης* were stated. This first book is lost, but was still extant in the time of Eusebius, Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ μέθης τοσαῦτα* (viz. two). Hieronymus, *vir. illustr.* 11: *de ebrietate duo.* They seem to have been in the hands of Johannes Monachus ineditus in the reverse order. For what he quotes with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ περὶ μέθης α'*, is found in that which has come down to us; while what he cites with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ περὶ μέθης δευτέρου λόγου*, is not found in it (Mangey, i. 357, note).

9. *Περὶ τοῦ ἐξένηψε Νῶε.* *De sobrietate* (Mangey, i. 392–403). On Gen. ix. 24.—In the best manuscripts (*Vaticanus* and *Mediceus*) the title runs: *περὶ ὧν ἀνανήψας ὁ νοῦς εὐχεται καὶ καταρᾶται* (Mangey, i. 392, note). Almost exactly the same, Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ ὧν νήψας ὁ νοῦς εὐχεται καὶ καταρᾶται.* Hieronymus, *vir. illustr.* 11: *de his quae sensu precamur et detestamur.*

10. *Περὶ συγχύσεως διαλέκτων.* *De confusione linguarum* (Mangey, i. 404–435). On Gen. xi. 1–9.—The same title also in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2. In the *Praep. evang.* xi. 15, Eusebius quotes several passages from it with the mistaken statement, that they are from: *Περὶ τοῦ τὸ χεῖρον τῷ κρείττονι φιλεῖν ἐπιτίθεσθαι.*

11. *Περὶ ἀποικίας.* *De migratione Abrahami* (Mangey, i.

436-472). On Gen. xii. 1-6. — The same title also in Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 18. 4.

12. *Περὶ τοῦ τίς ὁ τῶν θείων πραγμάτων κληρονόμος.* *Quis rerum divinarum haeres sit* (Mangey, i. 437-518). On Gen. xv. 1-18.—Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ τοῦ τίς ὁ τῶν θείων ἐστὶ κληρονόμος ἢ περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ ἴσα καὶ ἐναντία τομῆς.* Hieronymus, *vir. illustr.* 11, makes from this double title the two works: *De haerede divinarum rerum liber unus, De divisione aequalium et contrariorum liber.* Suidas, *Lex. s.v. Φίλων*,^{31a} also follows him. Johannes Monachus ineditus quotes this book with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ τίς ὁ τῶν θείων κληρονόμος* (Mangey, i. 473, note). When he likewise quotes it with the formula *ἐκ τοῦ περὶ κοσμοποιίας* (Mangey, *l.c.*), we must not conclude from this, that the latter was a general title, which was applied to this book as well as others,³² for we have here simply an error in quotation. In the commencement of this book a former composition is referred to in the words: *Ἐν μὲν τῇ πρὸ ταύτης βίβλῳ περὶ μισθῶν ὡς ἐνῆν ἐπ' ἀκριβείας διεξήλθομεν.* This composition is not lost as Mangey supposed (see his note on the passage), but is the book *περὶ ἀπουκίας*, which in fact treats *περὶ μισθῶν*.³³ We see at the same time, that Gen. xiii.-xiv. was not commented on by Philo.

13. *Περὶ τῆς εἰς τὰ προπαιδεύματα συνόδου.* *De congressu quaerendae eruditionis causa* (Mangey, i. 519-545). On Gen. xvi. 1-6.—In Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 18. 2, the title runs: *περὶ τῆς πρὸς τὰ παιδεύματα συνόδου.* But the *προπαιδεύματα*, which has come down in the Philo-manuscripts is preferable, for the fact, that Abraham cohabited with Hagar, before he had issue by Sarah, means according to Philo, that we must become acquainted with propaedeutic knowledge before we can rise to the higher wisdom and obtain its fruit, namely,

^{31a} Comp. also Grossmann, i. p. 24, on the fact of the two titles belonging to the same book.

³² Mangey, i. 473, nota. Comp. Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, p. 1000 sqq.

³³ Dähne, 1018 sq. Grossmann, i. p. 22.

virtue. Comp. also Philo's own allusion in the beginning of the following book (*de profugis*): *Εἰρηκότες ἐν τῷ προτέρῳ τὰ πρόποντα περὶ τῶν προπαιδευμάτων καὶ περὶ κακώσεως κ.τ.λ.*

14. *Περὶ φυγάδων.* *De profugis* (Mangey, i. 546-577). On Gen. xvi. 6-14.—Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ φυγῆς καὶ εὐρέσεως*.³⁴ And exactly so Johannes Monachus ineditus: *ἐκ τοῦ περὶ φυγῆς καὶ εὐρέσεως* (Mangey, i. 546, note). This is without doubt the correct title. For the work deals with the flight and refinding of Hagar.

15. *Περὶ τῶν μετονομαζομένων καὶ ὧν ἕνεκα μετονομάζονται.* *De mutatione nominum* (Mangey, i. 578-619). On Gen. xvii. 1-22.—The same title in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 3. Johannes Monachus ineditus quotes under this title much that is not found in this book, nor in any of the preserved works of Philo (Mangey, i. 578, note). In this book Philo alludes to a lost work: *Τὸν δὲ περὶ διαθηκῶν σύμπαντα λόγον ἐν δυσὶν ἀναγέγραφα πράξεσι*, which was no longer extant in the time of Eusebius (comp. *H. E.* ii. 18. 3).^{34a}

16. *Περὶ τοῦ θεοπέμπτους εἶναι τοὺς ὀνείρους.* *De somniis*, lib. i. (Mangey, i. 620-658). On Gen. xxviii. 12 sqq. and xxxi. 11 sqq. (the two dreams of Jacob).—Lib. ii. of the same work (Mangey, i. 659-699). On Gen. xxxvii. and xl. 41 (the dreams of Joseph and of Pharaoh's chief butler and baker).—According to Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 4 and Hieronymus, *vir. illustr.* 11, Philo wrote *five books* on dreams. Thus three are lost. Those that have come down to us seem, to judge from their openings, to be the second and third. In any case our first was preceded by another, which probably treated on the dream of Abimelech,³⁵ Gen. xx. 3. Origenes, *contra Celsum*,

³⁴ The text of Eusebius was here very early corrupted. Jerome (*de natura et inventione*) already read *φυγῆς* instead of *φύσεως*. By continued corruption there then arose in Nicephorus the double title: *ὁ περὶ φυγῆς καὶ αἰρίσεως* ἔτι τε *ὁ περὶ φύσεως καὶ εὐρίσεως*, which monstrosity has been even admitted into the text of Eusebius by his recent editors.

^{34a} The allusion in the *Quaest. et solut. in Exodum*, ed. Aucher, p. 493, certainly relates to the same work. Comp. Grossmann, i. p. 25.

³⁵ Gfrörer, i. 43. Dähne, 1025. Grossmann, i. 25

vi. 21, *fin.*, already mentions the paragraph on Jacob's ladder, Gen. xxviii. 12 (contained in the first of the preserved books).

III. The third chief group of Philo's works on the Pentateuch is a *Delineation of the Mosaic Legislation for non-Jews*. In this whole group indeed, the allegorical explanation is still occasionally employed. In the main however we have here actual historical delineations, a systematic statement of the great legislative work of Moses, the contents, excellence and importance of which, the author desires to make evident to non-Jewish readers, and indeed to as large a circle of them as possible. For the delineation is more a popular one, while the large allegorical commentary is an esoteric, and according to Philo's notions a strictly scientific work. The contents of the several compositions forming this group differ indeed considerably, and are apparently independent of each other. Their connection however, and consequently the composition of the whole work, cannot, according to Philo's own intimations, be doubtful. As to plan it is divided into *three parts*. (a) The beginning and as it were the introduction to the whole is formed by a description of the creation of the world (*κοσμοποιία*), which is placed first by Moses for the purpose of showing, that his legislation and its precepts are in conformity with the will of nature (*πρὸς τὸ βούλημα τῆς φύσεως*), and that consequently he who obeys it is truly a citizen of the world (*κοσμοπολίτης*) (*de mundi opif.* § 1). This introduction is next followed by (b) *biographies of virtuous men*. These are, as it were, the living, unwritten laws (*ἔμφυχοι καὶ λογικοὶ νόμοι de Abrahamo*, § 1, *νόμοι ἔγραφοι de decalogo*, § 1), which represent, in distinction from the written and specific commands, universal moral norms (*τοὺς καθολικωτέρους καὶ ὡσὰν ἀρχετύπους νόμους de Abrahamo*, § 1). Lastly, the third part embraces (c) *the delineation of the legislation proper*, which is divided into two parts: (1) that of the ten chief commandments of the law, and (2) that of the special laws belonging to each of these ten commandments. Then follow by way of appendix a few treatises on certain

cardinal virtues, and on the rewards of the good and the punishments of the wicked. This survey of the contents shows at once, that it was Philo's intention to place before his readers a clear description of the entire contents of the Pentateuch, which should be in essential matters complete. His view however is in this respect the genuinely Jewish one, that these entire contents fall under the notion of the νόμος. The work begins with:

1. *Περὶ τῆς Μωϋσέως κοσμοποιίας. De mundi opificio* (Mangey, i. 1-42).—It was customary to place this work at the head of Philo's works, before the first book of the *Legum allegoriarum*. And this position has been resolutely defended, especially by Dähne.³⁶ Gfrörer on the other hand already convincingly showed, that the book *de Abrahamo* must be immediately joined to *de mundi opificio*.³⁷ He has only erred in the matter of declaring this whole group of writings older than the allegorical commentary (p. 33 sq.). It was easy to show in reply, that this popular delineation of the Mosaic legislation is on the contrary more recent than the bulk of the allegorical commentary.³⁸ On the other hand there is nothing to prevent our relegating the work *de mundi opificio* also, to the more recent group. We have already shown, p. 331 above, that it is *not* connected with the allegorical commentary. On the contrary the beginning of the work *de mundi opificio* makes it quite evident that it was to form the introduction to the delineation of the legislation, and it is equally plain, that the composition *de Abrahamo* directly follows it. Comp. *de Abrahamo*, § 1: "Ὁν μὲν οὖν τρόπον ἡ κοσμοποιία διατέτακται, διὰ τῆς προτέρας συντάξεως, ὡς οὐδὲν τε ἦν, ἡκριβώσαμεν. To refer this intimation to the whole series of the allegorical commentaries is, both by reason of the expression *κοσμοποιία* and of the singular *διὰ*

³⁶ Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1838, p. 1000 sqq. Ersch and Gruber's *Encyklop.* art. "Philon," p. 441. Comp. also Grossmann, ii. p. 6. J. G. Müller, *Des Juden Philo Buch von der Weltschöpfung*, pp. 18, 15 sqq. The same in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 1st ed. xi. 581.

³⁷ Gfrörer, i. pp. 8-10.

³⁸ See especially Grossmann, ii. pp. 18, 14.

τῆς προτέρας συντάξεως, quite impossible.—But however certain all this is, the matter is not thus as yet settled. For on the other hand it is just as certain, that the composition *de mundi opificio* was subsequently placed at the head of the allegorical commentaries to compensate for the missing commentary on Gen. i. Only thus can it be explained that Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* viii. 13, quotes a passage from this composition with the formula (viii. 12, *fin.* ed. Gaisford): ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου τῶν εἰς τὸν νόμον.³⁹ It is just this which explains the transposition of this treatise into the catalogue of Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* ii. 18 (it was in his eyes comprised in the νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίαι), and also the peculiar form of citation: ἐκ τοῦ ζ καὶ η [resp. ἐκ τοῦ η καὶ θ] τῆς νόμων ἱερῶν ἀλληγορίας, mentioned p. 333 above.—There still remains the question, whether this *supplementary* insertion of the *Legum allegoriae* between *de mundi opificio* and *de Abrahamo* originated with Philo himself? This is especially the view of Siegfried.⁴⁰ It seems to me however, that the reasons brought forward are not conclusive.⁴¹ J. G. Müller has lately

³⁹ Another quotation from this treatise is introduced in the *Praep. evang.* with the formula (xi. 23, *fin.* Gaisf.): λίγαι δ' οὖν ὁ Ἑβραῖος Φίλων τὰ πατρια διερμηνεύων αὐτοῖς ῥήμασιν.

⁴⁰ *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1874, p. 562 sqq.

⁴¹ For this arrangement of Philo's writings ((1) Creation of the world, (2) Allegorical commentary, (3) Legislation) the following two passages have, since Dühne, been cited as conclusive: 1. *Vita Mosis*, ed. Mang. ii. 141, where it is said of the Holy Scriptures, which Moses composed: τὸ μὲν ἱστορικὸν μέρος, τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς προτάξεις καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις, ὑπὲρ οὗ δεύτερον λέγομεν, τὸ πρότερον τῇ τάξει πρότερον ἀκριβώσαντες. Ἔστιν οὖν τοῦ ἱστορικοῦ τὸ μὲν περὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως, τὸ δὲ γενεολογικόν· τοῦ δὲ γενεολογικοῦ τὸ μὲν περὶ κολάσεως ἀσιβδόν, τὸ δ' αὖ περὶ τιμῆς δικαίων. Philo here divides the contents of the Mosaic writings into only two chief groups, the *historical* and the *legislative*. When he then says, that he would treat of the latter after having already minutely treated of the former, it follows first only, that the delineation of the Mosaic legislation was later than the allegorical commentary (to which the expression with respect to the ἱστορικὸν μέρος probably refers; for the βίαι σοφῶν, which treat only of the good, not of both good and bad, cannot by any means be intended). When he next goes on to again divide the historical portion more particularly into two sections: (1) περὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως, (2) τὸ γενεολογικόν, we may certainly infer, that the composition of *de mundi opificio*

brought out a separate edition of this composition with a commentary.⁴²

2. *Βίος σοφοῦ τοῦ κατὰ διδασκαλίαν τελειωθέντος ἡ περὶ νόμων ἀγράφων* [α'], ὃ ἐστὶ περὶ Ἀβραάμ. *De Abrahamo* (Mangey, ii. 1–40).—With this composition commences the group of the *νόμοι ἀγραφοί*, i.e. the *βίοι σοφῶν* (*de decalogo*, § 1), the biographies of virtuous men, who exhibit by their exemplary behaviour the universal types of morality. Of such types there are twice three, viz. (1) Enos, Enoch, Noah; (2) Abraham, Isaac, Jacob. Enos represents *ἐλπίς*, Enoch *μετάνοια καὶ βελτίωσις*, Noah *δικαιοσύνη* (*de Abrahamo*, § 2, 3, 5). The second triad is more exalted: Abraham is the symbol of *διδασκαλικὴ ἀρετή* (virtue acquired by learning), Isaac of *φυσικὴ ἀρετή* (innate virtue), Jacob of *ἀσκητικὴ ἀρετή* (virtue attained by practice), see *de Abrahamo*, § 11; *de Josepho*, § 1 (Zeller, iii. 2. 411). The first three are only briefly dwelt on. The greater part of this composition is occupied with Abraham.—In Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 18. 4, the title runs: *βίου* [read *βίος*] *σοφοῦ τοῦ κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τελειωθέντος ἡ [περὶ] νόμων ἀγράφων*. *Δικαιοσύνην*, instead of the *διδασκαλίαν* furnished by the Philo manuscripts, is here certainly incorrect. For Abraham is the type of *διδασκαλικὴ ἀρετή*. The number α' must be inserted after *ἀγράφων*, this book being only the first of the unwritten laws.

must be placed before that of the *vita Mosis*, which is also probable on other grounds (see note 82 below). *At all events there is in the passage no intimation as to what was the actual order of Philo's own works.* 2. This is also the case with the second passage, *de praemiis et poenis*, ed. Mang. ii. 408 sq. Philo here divides the revelations (*λόγια*) imparted by means of Moses into three categories (*βίαι*), viz. (1) *τὴν περὶ κοσμοποιίας*, (2) *τὸ ἱστορικὸν μέρος*, i.e. the *ἀναγραφὴ πονηρῶν καὶ σπουδαίων βίων*, and (3) *τὸ νομοθετικὸν μέρος*. Of all this he had, so far as time allowed, treated in his former writings. This indication too can with respect to the *ἱστορικὸν μέρος* refer only to the allegorical commentary. I cannot however discern in it any intimation as to the actual order of Philo's own works, since only the order of the contents of the Pentateuch is given, and it is said, that all this was treated of in Philo's earlier writings.

⁴² J. G. Müller, *Des Juden Philo Buch von der Welterschöpfung*, herausgegeben und erklärt, Berlin 1841.

3. *Βίος πολιτικός ὅπερ ἐστὶ περὶ Ἰωσήφ. De Josepho* (Mangey, ii. 41–79).—After the life of Abraham we next expect the biographies of Isaac and Jacob. That Philo wrote these is made certain by the opening of *de Josepho*. They seem however to have been very soon lost, since not a trace of them is anywhere preserved. The beginning of *de Josepho* makes it also certain, that this composition follows here, which is strange, since we might have expected that the number of typical *βίοι* was exhausted with the triad Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. Joseph however is made to succeed them, because the examples of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob refer only to the ideal cosmopolitan state of the world, not to the empiric world with its various constitutions. The life of Joseph is therefore said to show, “how the wise man has to move in actually existing political life.”⁴³—In the editions the title is *βίος πολιτικοῦ*, the manuscripts have *βίος πολιτικός* (Mangey, ii. 41, note. Pitra, *Analecta*, ii. 317). Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 6: ὁ πολιτικός. Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* 103: *περὶ βίου πολιτικοῦ*. Suidas, *Lex. gr.* Ἀβραάμ· Φίλων ἐν τῷ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ βίῳ (Suidas in the article *Φίλων*, following the Greek translator of Jerome, writes *περὶ ἀγωγῆς βίου*).

4. *Περὶ τῶν δέκα λογίων ἢ κεφάλαια νόμων εἰσὶ. De decalogo* (Mangey, ii. 180–209).—After the life of Joseph is generally inserted the life of Moses, which certainly would, according to its literary character, be in place in this group. It is however nowhere intimated that this composition, which comes forward quite independently, is organically connected with the entire work now under discussion. Nay it would be an interruption in it. For in it Moses as a lawgiver stands alone, he is thus no universally valid type of moral conduct, nor is he depicted as such.—Hence the composition *de decalogo* with which the representation of the legislation proper (*τῶν ἀναγραφέντων νόμων, de decal.* § 1) begins, recites indeed first of all the ten commandments, given by God Himself without the intervention of Moses, must necessarily follow

⁴³ Siegfried, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theologie*, 1874, p. 565 sq.

the life of Joseph.—The title of this composition vacillates very much in the manuscripts (Mangey, ii. 180, note). The usual form *περὶ τῶν δέκα λογίων*, resting on the *cod. Augustanus*, is confirmed by Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 5. Jerome, in consequence of a careless abbreviation in the text of Eusebius, has *de tabernaculo et decalogo libri quattuor*.

5. *Περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἰδει νόμων εἰς τὰ συντείνοντα κεφάλαια τῶν δέκα λόγων α' β' γ' δ'.* *On the special laws referring to the respective heads of the ten sayings.* Such is the title according to Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 5 of the work *de specialibus legibus*; and with this agree the Philo-manuscripts with the sole exception, that instead of *εἰς τὰ συντείνοντα κεφάλαια τῶν δέκα λόγων* its special contents are stated for each of the four books (*e.g. εἰς τρία γένη τῶν δέκα λόγων, τὸ τρίτον, τὸ τέταρτον, τὸ πέμπτον κ.τ.λ.*). In this work Philo makes a very laudable attempt to reduce the special Mosaic laws to a systematic arrangement, according to the ten rubrics of the decalogue. Thus he states in connection with the first and second commandments (the worship of God) the entire legislation concerning the priesthood and sacrifices, in connection with the fourth (the sanctification of the Sabbath) all the laws concerning festivals, in connection with the seventh (the prohibition of adultery) the marriage laws, in connection with the remaining three the entire civil and criminal law. Herein, notwithstanding the brevity of statement, we frequently recognise an agreement with the Palestinian Halachah. Philo indeed has no professional acquaintance with it, on which account we also meet with many divergences therefrom.⁴⁴ According to the testimony of Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 18. 5, the whole work comprised *four books*, which have, it seems, been preserved entire, though needing to be restored, from the mangling they have undergone in the manuscripts.

(a) Book I.: *περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἰδει νόμων εἰς β' κεφάλαια τῶν δέκα λογίων τό τε μὴ νομίζειν ἔξω ἐνὸς θεοῦ*

⁴⁴ On Philo's relation to the Halachah, comp. the careful investigation of Bernh. Ritter, *Philo und die Halacha, eine vergleichende Studie*, Leipzig 1879.

ἐτέρους αὐτοκράτεις καὶ τὸ μὴ χειρότητα θεὸν πλαστεῖν. This title, which is missing in the editions, stands in the *cod. Medicus* at the head of the treatise *de circumcissione* (Mangey, ii. 210, note). But even without this external evidence, the commencement of the said treatise would of itself prove, that this first book begins with it. The whole book comprises the following pieces: *de circumcissione* (Mangey, ii. 210–212), *de monarchia* (Mangey, ii. 213–222),⁴⁵ *de monarchia*, lib. ii. (Mangey, ii. 222–232), *de praemiis sacerdotum* (ii. 232–237), *de victimis* (ii. 237–250),⁴⁶ *de sacrificantiibus* or *de victimas offerentiibus* (ii. 251–264), *de mercede meretricis non accipienda in sacrarium* (ii. 264–269).⁴⁷

(b) Book II.: *περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἵδει νόμων εἰς τρία γένη τῶν δέκα λόγων, τὸ τρίτον, τὸ τέταρτον, τὸ πέμπτον, τὸ περὶ εὐορκίας καὶ σεβασμοῦ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἑβδομάδος καὶ γονέων τιμῆς*.⁴⁸ Under this title the editions give first only a small portion (Mangey, ii. 270–277), and then add as a separate portion the treatise *de septenario* (Mangey, ii. 227–298), which of course belongs to this book. The text of *de septenario* is however incomplete in Mangey, and the treatise which we expect, *de colendis parentibus*, is entirely missing. The greater portion of this missing treatise was already given by Mai (*De cophini festo et de colendis parentibus*, Mediolan. 1818, also in *Classicor. auctor.* vol. iv. 402–429); but the complete text of this book was first given by Tischendorf, *Philonea*, pp. 1–83.⁴⁹

(c) Book III.: *περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἵδει νόμων εἰς δύο γένη τῶν δέκα λόγων, τὸ ἕκτον καὶ τὸ ἑβδομον, τὸ κατὰ μοίχων καὶ παντὸς ἀκολάστου καὶ τὸ κατὰ ἀνδροφόνων καὶ πάσης βίας* (Mangey, ii. 299–334).—According to Mangey, ii. 299, note, Philo here shows a knowledge of Roman law.

⁴⁵ The beginning is also in Euseb. *Praep. ev.* xiii. 18. 12 sqq. ed. Gaisford.

⁴⁶ This piece is mentioned Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 5, as a separate composition: *περὶ τῶν εἰς τὰς λειτουργίας ζώων καὶ τίνα τὰ τῶν θυσιῶν εἶδη*.

⁴⁷ On where this piece belongs, see especially Gfrörer, i. 12 sq.

⁴⁸ The title according to Tischendorf, *Philonea*, p. 1.

⁴⁹ Emendations to the text of Tischendorf were given by Holwerda, 1873. See note 12 above.

(d) Book IV.: *περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἵδει νόμων εἰς τρία γένη τῶν δέκα λογίων, τὸ ἡ' καὶ τὸ θ' καὶ ἰ', τὸ περὶ τοῦ μὴ ἐπικλέπτειν καὶ ψευδομαρτυρεῖν καὶ μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν καὶ τῶν ἐς ἕκαστον ἀναφερομένων καὶ περὶ δικαιοσύνης, ἥ πᾶσι τοῖς λογίοις ἐφαρμόζει, ὃ ἐστὶ τῆς συντάξεως* (Mangey, ii. 335-358).—This book was first published by Mangey from the *cod. Bodleianus*, 3400. Some kind of word (such as τέλος) or the number δ' is missing at the close of the title. In the editions the last sections also appear under the special titles: *de iudice* (ii. 344-348) and *de concupiscentia* (ii. 348-358). That they are also integral portions of this book cannot, considering their contents, be doubtful.—To the same book too belongs as an appendix, the treatise *περὶ δικαιοσύνης, de iustitia* (Mangey, ii. 358-374), which again is in the editions wrongly divided into two sections: *de iustitia* (ii. 358-361) and *de creatione principum* (ii. 361-374). The latter section does not deal exclusively with the appointment of authorities, but is simply a continuation of the treatise *de iustitia*. This whole treatise is closely connected with the fourth book *de specialibus legibus*, nay forms part of it, as is intimated by the closing words of the latter (Mang. ii. 358: *νυνὶ δὲ περὶ τῆς . . . δικαιοσύνης λεκτέου*) and especially by the title of the whole book, in which it is expressly stated, that it also treats *περὶ δικαιοσύνης, ἥ πᾶσι τοῖς λογίοις ἐφαρμόζει* (Mangey, ii. 335).⁵⁰

6. *Περὶ τριῶν ἀρετῶν ἥτοι περὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ μετανοίας. De fortitudine* (Mangey, ii. 375-383), *de caritate* (ii. 383-405), *de poenitentia* (ii. 405-407).—The treatise *de iustitia*, the continuation of which is here given, is referred to in the commencement of this book (*περὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὴν ὄσα καίρια πρίτερον εἰπὼν, μέτειμι*

⁵⁰ In Mangey *λογίοις* is printed. I suppose this, a printer's error, is for *λογίαις*. At all events the latter must be the reading. For the thought is, that justice, like the other cardinal virtues, is realized, not by the practice of any one of the commandments, but by the practice of all the ten (it is *τοῖς δέκα λογίοις ἐφαρμόττουσα*, as it is said at the close of *de concupiscentia* (Mang. ii. 358).

τὸ ἐξῆς ἐπ' ἀνδρίαν). This book then also belongs to the appendix of the work *de specialibus legibus*, and it was only an external reason (viz. that of making the two books nearly equal in extent) which occasioned Philo to combine a portion of this appendix with the fourth book itself, and to give the rest as a separate book.⁵¹ The title of this book is found, as given by Mangey in *cod. Bodleianus* (Mang. ii. 375, note). Confirmed by Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 2: *περὶ τῶν τριῶν ἀρετῶν, ἃς σὺν ἄλλαις ἀνέγραψε Μωϋσῆς*. Hieronymus, *vir. illustr.* 11: *de tribus virtutibus liber unus*. Two manuscripts, the *Mediceus* and *Lincolniensis*, have on the other hand: *περὶ ἀρετῶν ἦτοι περὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ εὐσεβείας καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ μετανόας*. It seems to speak in favour of this title, that the treatise *de caritate* begins with the words (Mang. ii. 383): *τὴν δὲ εὐσεβείας συγγενεστάτην καὶ ἀδελφὴν καὶ δίδυμον ὄντως ἐξῆς ἐπισκεπτέον, φιλανθρωπίαν*, as though a treatise *de pietate* were missing between *de fortitudine* and *de caritate*. Still the words do not necessarily require this meaning. On the contrary the title of the *Med.* and *Lincoln.* seems to have arisen from this incorrect meaning.⁵²—According to Gfrörer and Dähne only the treatise *de fortitudine* is in place here, and the two others (*de caritate* and *de poenitentia*) must be entirely separated from it and added as an appendix to the

⁵¹ That such external reasons were of authority in the literary activity of the ancients is shown especially by Birt (*Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Litteratur*, 1882).—In Philo it is observable almost throughout, that his books occupy about thirty to forty pages in Mangey's edition.

⁵² The predicate *τὴν εὐσεβείας συγγενεστάτην* is said to serve only to characterize the high value of the *φιλανθρωπία* (it is directly related to *εὐσέβεια*, the source of all virtues).—According to the close of *de concupiscentia* (Mang. ii. 358), Philo had already on a former occasion spoken on *εὐσέβεια* and some other cardinal virtues (*περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἡγεμονίδος τῶν ἀρετῶν εὐσεβείας καὶ δσιότητος, ἔτι δὲ καὶ φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης εἰρηκαί πρότερον*). It is probable that this does not mean a separate lost book, but certain sections in the books that have come down to us. See Grossmann, i. pp. 22–24.—We see moreover that the Stoic enumeration of four cardinal virtues, which Philo elsewhere adopts (*Leg. alleg.* i. 56, Mang.: *φρόνησις, σωφροσύνη, ἀνδρία, δικαιοσύνη*; comp. Zeller, 3rd ed. iii. 2. 403), is here also the basis, though not strictly adhered to.

Vita Mosis.⁵³ The sole foundation however for this view is the bare fact, that in the beginning of *de caritate* the *Vita Mosis* is cited. This is certainly too weak an argument to oppose to the testimony of the manuscripts to the connection of these three treatises with each other. Their contents on the contrary show, that the treatises here placed together, belong to the work *de specialibus legibus*. Those Mosaic laws also are here placed together which belong, not to the rubrics of the ten commandments, but to the rubric of certain cardinal virtues, which latter indeed are only actually realized by the practice of the Decalogue in its entirety (compare the close of *de concupiscentia*, ii. 358, Mangey).⁵⁴

7. *Περὶ ἄθλων καὶ ἐπιτιμίων*. *De praeemiis et poenis* (Mangey, ii. 408–428).—*Περὶ ἁρῶν*. *De execrationibus* (Mangey, ii. 429–437).—These two pieces so inaptly separated from each other form in reality but one book. Comp. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 5: *περὶ τῶν προκειμένων ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τοῖς μὲν ἀγαθοῖς ἄθλων, τοῖς δὲ πονηροῖς ἐπιτιμίων καὶ ἁρῶν*.—In the beginning of this composition Philo says, that having in his former works treated of the three main categories of the Mosaic revelations (the *κοσμοποιία*, the *ἱστορικόν* and the *νομοθετικόν μέρος*), he now purposed to pass to the rewards appointed for the good, and the penalties destined for the wicked. Hence this writing is later than the works of Philo hitherto discussed and joins on as a sort of epilogue to the delineation of the Mosaic legislation.—On the treatise *de nobilitate*, which Mangey combines with this composition, see below, No. IV. 7.

IV. Besides these three large works on the Pentateuch,

⁵³ Gfrörer, i. 17–23. Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, pp. 1033–1036. Ersch and Grüber, art. "Philon," p. 443.

⁵⁴ Gfrörer certainly asserts (i. 20) that the treatise *de caritate* "is not written in so didactic and analytic a manner as the compositions *de fortitudine* and *de justitia*, but historically and with constant reference to the life of Moses." In truth however the *de caritate*, being a summary of all such Mosaic laws as fall under the rubric of *φιλασθεμιὰ* (comp. the survey of its contents in Richter's ed. v. 181), properly belongs to the work *de specialibus legibus*.

Philo wrote several separate compositions, of which the following have been preserved, some entire, some in fragments.

1. *Περὶ βίου Μωσέως*.⁵⁵ *Vita Mosis*, lib. i. (Mangey, ii. 80–133), lib. ii. (Mangey, ii. 134–144), lib. iii. (Mangey, ii. 145–179).—The division into three books is already found in the manuscripts, but is certainly a false one, as is proved by the following quotation by Philo himself, *de caritate*, § 1 (Mangey, ii. 383 sq.): *δεδήλωται πρότερον ἐν δυσὶ συντάξεσιν, ὡς ἀνέγραψα περὶ τοῦ βίου Μωϋσέως*.⁵⁶ Our books i. and ii. are in fact but one book, as even their extent serves to show. The work is already quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* i. 23. 153: *ἡ φησι Φίλων ἐν τῷ Μωϋσέως βίῳ*. Comp. also *Strom.* ii. 19. 100. Hence it is the more remarkable, that it should be absent from the catalogue of Eusebius. In its place appears (*H. E.* ii. 18. 5) a work *περὶ τῆς σκηνῆς*. Now as the tabernacle is fully described in the *Vita Mosis*, the treatise *περὶ τῆς σκηνῆς* is certainly a portion of the *Vita Mosis*;⁵⁷ probably however the text of Eusebius is imperfect. The date of composition of this work was according to Mangey, ii. 141 (see the passage, note 41 above), probably antecedent to that of the large work on the Mosaic legislation; but probably subsequent to *de mundi opificio* (see below, note 82), and thus, to speak more precisely, between *de mundi opif.* and *de Abrahamo*. We have already seen (p. 342 sq.), that it is no integral element of the delineation of the Mosaic legislation, though certainly connected with it by its entire literary character. *For as in the larger work the Mosaic legislation, so in this the*

⁵⁵ Mangey gives the title in the following form: *Περὶ βίου Μωϋσέως (sic!) ὅτι ἐστὶ περὶ θεολογίας καὶ προφητείας*. The addition is a very inappropriate one, since the work treats first (Book i.) of Moses as a ruler, and afterwards (Book ii.) of Moses as lawgiver, priest and prophet.

⁵⁶ The reading *τρεῖς* adopted by Mangey and his followers instead of *δυσὶ* is found in only one manuscript, *cod. Paris*, Reg. 2251 (Mangey, ii. 80, note, 383, note). Comp. also Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, p. 1031 sq. Ewald, vi. 300.

⁵⁷ So also Grossmann, i. p. 24.

life and acts of the legislator himself are portrayed for heathen readers.

2. *Περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεύθερον*. *Quod omnis probus liber* (Mangey, ii. 445-470).—This work is properly only one half of a larger one, which worked out the thought suggested in the title in its two opposite aspects, Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 6: *περὶ τοῦ δούλον εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον, ὃ ἐξῆς ἐστὶν ὁ περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον ἐλεύθερον εἶναι*. Philo himself alludes to the first and missing half in the opening of the second and preserved half. A long portion of the latter (on the Essenes) is given in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 12. The genuineness of the work has not been unassailed. The circumstance that the description of the Essenes differs in a few subordinate points from that given by Philo himself in another work (*Apologia pro Judaeis* in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11), has especially given rise to suspicion. Its genuineness is however, according to the thorough investigations of Lucius, surpassingly probable. The work may, it is conjectured, belong to Philo's earliest period and may not give the description of the Essenes according to his own inspection.⁵⁸

3. *Εἰς Φλάκκον*. *Adversus Flaccum* (Mangey, ii. 517-544).—*Περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ πρεσβείας πρὸς Γάιον*. *De legatione ad Cajum* (Mangey, ii. 545-600).—In these two books Philo relates the persecutions which the Jews had to endure, especially at Alexandria, in the time of Caligula. The narrative is so detailed and graphic, that it could be written only by one who had himself participated in a prominent manner in the events. This circumstance makes these two books an authority of the first rank, not only for the history of the Jews of those days, but also for the history of Caligula. It cannot be perceived from the statements in Mangey, how the

⁵⁸ Lucius, *Der Essenismus* (1881), pp. 13-23. Hilgenfeld also esteems this work genuine, but on the contrary regards the *Apologia pro Judaeis* as spurious (*Zeitschrift für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1882, pp. 275-278. *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, 1884, pp. 87 sq., 105-116).

titles run in the best manuscripts. On the title *Φίλωνος εἰς Φλάκκον* he only remarks (ii. 517): *similiter codex Mediceus, in reliquis vero manuscriptis scribitur Φίλωνος Ἑβραίου ἱστορία ὠφέλιμος καὶ πάνν βίη χρήσιμος. Τὰ κατὰ τὸν Φλάκκον* [*sic*: therefore not *τοῦ Φλάκκου*] *ἦτοι περὶ προνοίας.*^{58a} Still more indefinite are Mangey's statements concerning the title of the second composition (ii. 545): in nonnullis codicibus sic legitur: *ἱστορία χρήσιμος καὶ πάνν ὠφέλιμος περὶ τῶν κατὰ τὸν Γάϊον καὶ τῆς αἰτίας τῆς πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ἀπεχθείας αὐτοῦ.* According to the statements of Pitra (*Analecta sacra*, ii. 318 sq.) the titles usual in the printed text *Εἰς Φλάκκον* and *Περὶ ἀρετῶν καὶ πρεσβείας πρὸς Γάϊον* appear to be also those which prevail in the manuscripts. In Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 105 (ed. Bekker), it is said: *Ἀνεγνώσθη δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ λόγος οὗ ἡ ἐπιγραφή "Γάϊος ψεγόμενος" καὶ "Φλάκκος ἢ Φλάκκων ψεγόμενος," ἐν οἷς λόγοις κ.τ.λ.* (therefore two *λόγοι*). So too Eusebius in the *Chronicle*.⁵⁹ Comp. also Johannes Monachus ineditus (Mangey, ii. 517): *ἐκ τῶν κατὰ Φλάκκον.* On the titles mentioned by Eusebius in the *Ecclesiastical History* see farther on. Only the two books which have come down to us seem to have been extant in the time of Photius. But the beginning of the first and the close of the second show, that they are only portions of a larger whole. For the book *adversus Flaccum* begins (ii. 517): *Δεύτερος μετὰ Σηιανὸν Φλάκκος Ἀουίλλιος διαδέχεται τὴν κατὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπιβουλήν.* Thus this book was preceded by another, in which the persecutions inflicted on the Jews by Sejanus were narrated. The book *de legatione*

^{58a} The title *κατὰ Φλάκκον* also in the *codex Coislinianus* is in Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. 310.

⁵⁹ Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, ii. 150-151. The text runs: (a) according to Jerome (*l.c.* p. 151, note k): *Refert Filo in eo libro qui Flaccus inscribitur*; (b) according to the Armenian (p. 150, note g): *Philon in eo libro, quem ipse ad Flacum scripsit, refert*; (c) according to Syncellus (ed. Dindorf, i. 626): *Φίλων ἱστορίᾳ ἐν τῇ ἐπιγραφῇ μὲν λόγῳ Φλάκκῳ* (the title *ad Flacum* in the Armenian translation arose from a mistaken understanding of this dative *Φλάκκῳ*). Thus a comparison of Jerome and the Armenian shows, that the correct text of Eusebius is preserved in Syncellus.

ad Cajum moreover ends with the words: *Εἴρηται μὲν οὖν κεφαλαιωδέστερον ἡ αἰτία τῆς πρὸς ἅπαν τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ἀπεχθείας Γάϊον λεκτέον δὲ καὶ τὴν παλινφθίαν [πρὸς Γάϊον].*⁶⁰ Hence another book must have followed, in which Philo related the *παλινφθία*, i.e. the turn for the better in the fate of the Jews by the death of Caligula and the edict of toleration of Claudius. Now we know also from a notice in the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, that the persecutions under Sejanus were related in the *second book* of this entire work.⁶¹ Consequently we should reckon not less than *five books* for the whole. And this is confirmed by the decided statement in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebius, ii. 5. 1: *καὶ δὴ τὰ κατὰ Γάϊον οὗτος Ἰουδαίους συμβάντα πέντε βιβλίοις παραδίδωσι.* The brief survey too, given by Eusebius of the contents of this work, agrees exactly with these results. For he says, that Philo here relates, how in the time of Tiberius Sejanus made great exertions in Rome to destroy the whole nation, and that in Judaea Pilate caused great commotion among the Jews, because he desired to undertake something with respect to the temple, which was contrary to their institutions.⁶² After the death however of Tiberius, Caius, who then came to the throne, behaved indeed with the greatest arrogance to all, but inflicted most injury on the

⁶⁰ The words *πρὸς Γάϊον* are according to Mangey missing in the manuscripts, and must therefore certainly be expunged.

⁶¹ Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, ii. 150–151, and indeed: (a) according to Jerome (*l.c.* p. 151, note b): *Seianus praefectus Tiberii, qui apud eum plurimum poterat, instantissime cohortatur, ut gentem Judaeorum deleat. Filo meminit in libro legationis secundo.* (b) According to the Armenian (p. 150): *Seianus Tiberii procurator, qui intus erat consiliarius regis, universam gentem Judaeorum deperdendam exposcebat. Meminit autem hujus Philon in secunda relatione.* (c) According to Syncellus (ed. Dindorf, i. 621): *Σηανὸς ἑπαρχὸς Τιβερίου Καίσαρος περὶ τελείας ἀπολείας τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων πολλὰ συμβούλους τῷ Καίσαρι, ὡς Φίλων Ἰουδαίος ἐξ Ἀλεξανδρείας διὰ τῶν ἱστοριῶν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ πρεσβείας.*

⁶² *H. E.* ii. 5. 7: *Πρῶτον δὲ οὖν κατὰ Τιβερίον ἐπὶ μὲν τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως ἱστορεῖ Σηιανόν . . . ἄρδην τὸ πᾶν ἔθνος ἀπολείσθαι σπουδὴν εἰσπηγῶν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς Ἰουδαίας Πιλάτον . . . περὶ τὸ ἐν Ἱερουσολύμοις ἔτι τότε συνιστῶς ἱερὸν ἐπιχειρήσαντά τι παρὰ τὸ Ἰουδαίους ἐξόν τὰ μέγιστα αὐτοῦς ἀνταρᾶξαι.*

whole Jewish nation.⁶³ What is here said respecting Sejanus and Pilate cannot refer to some occasional declarations in the books preserved to us. For these treat only of the time of Caligula. The oppressions however of Sejanus and Pilate must, according to the above intimations of Eusebius, have been related in a separate paragraph, before the events under Caligula. From all that has been said the following must consequently have been the *arrangement of the whole work*. Book i. contained, it may be presumed, a general introduction. Book ii. related the oppressions in the reign of Tiberius, by Sejanus in Rome and by Pilate in Judaea. Among the former must undoubtedly be placed the important measure of A.D. 19, by which all Jews were banished from Rome.⁶⁴ Among the attempts of Pilate "to undertake something with respect to the temple contrary to Jewish institutions," the setting up of consecrated shields in the palace of Herod, mentioned in the letter of Agrippa,⁶⁵ communicated by Philo, cannot at all events be intended; we must rather regard them as the facts recorded by Josephus, viz. that Pilate caused the soldiers to march into Jerusalem with the imperial ensigns and employed the temple-treasure in building an aqueduct.⁶⁶ That the former act was also related by Philo is expressly testified by Eusebius.⁶⁷ Book iii. is the preserved composition *adversus Flaccum*, which relates the persecution of the Alexandrian

⁶³ H. E. ii. 6. 1: Μετὰ δὲ τὴν Τιβερίου τελευτὴν Γάϊον τὴν ἀρχὴν παρελθόντα . . . πάντων μάλιστα τὸ πᾶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος οὐ σμικρὰ κατεβλάψαι.

⁶⁴ Tacitus, *Annal.* ii. 85. Sueton. *Tiber.* 36. Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 3. 5. Comp. also Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 24 (Mang. ii. 569).

⁶⁵ Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 38 (Mang. ii. 589 sq.).

⁶⁶ Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 3. 1-2. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 9. 2-4. Comp. Euseb. H. E. ii. 6.

⁶⁷ Euseb. *Demonstratio evangelica*, viii. p. 403: Αὐτὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ ὁ Φίλων συμμαρτυρεῖ, τὰς σημεῖας φάσκων τὰς βασιλικὰς τὸν Πιλάτον εὐκταρὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ ἀναθεῖναι. A confusion with Josephus cannot exist, since Eusebius just before in the same passage quotes Josephus also as authority for the same fact.—It must also be remembered, that the setting up of the statue took place according to Philo in the temple, i.e. the temple forecourt (which indeed Eusebius erroneously gives as also the account of Josephus).

Jews arising from the initiative of the populace of that city in the commencement of Caligula's reign. It had as yet nothing to do with the setting up of the statue of the emperor in the Jewish synagogue, nor with any edict of Caligula. In Book iv., on the contrary, *i.e.* in the *Legatio ad Cajum*, which is preserved, are depicted the sufferings inflicted on the Jews in consequence of the edict of Caligula, that Divine honours should everywhere be paid him. Lastly, the lost Book v. treated of the *παλινοφδία* in the sense stated above.

The statements of Eusebius give rise also to some difficulties with regard to the *title of the entire work*. According to the passage from the *Chronicle* quoted above (note 61), the whole work seems to have been designated *ἡ πρεσβεία*. And Eusebius says also, when giving the contents of the whole work, that all this is written *ἐν ᾗ συνέγραψε πρεσβεία* (*H. E.* ii. 5. 6). This title is therefore possible, because Philo's account of the embassy to Caligula, of which he was the leader, forms in fact the kernel of the whole. The several books might then have had their special titles, such as *Φλάκκος* or the like (see above, p. 350). Now Eusebius says further, towards the conclusion of his summary of the contents, that Philo had related a thousand other sufferings, which befell the Jews at Alexandria *ἐν δευτέρῳ συγγράμματι ᾧ ἐπέγραψε "περὶ ἀρετῶν"* (*H. E.* ii. 6. 3). From this it appears to result, that Philo had treated of these events in two works, the title of one being *ἡ πρεσβεία*, of the other *περὶ ἀρετῶν*. This inference is however precluded not only by its improbability, but by the circumstance, that Eusebius in his chief catalogue of Philo's writings, *H. E.* ii. 18, only mentions the latter title. He says, that Philo ironically gave to his work on the ungodly deeds of Caius the title *περὶ ἀρετῶν* (*H. E.* ii. 18. 8). No other work referring to these events is mentioned, though the catalogue is in other respects a very complete one. We are thus, I think, constrained to admit, that the *δευτέρῳ* is the gloss of a transcriber, who could not make the different titles in ii. 5. 6 and ii. 6. 3 harmonize,

and that in fact both titles refer to one and the same work.

A special interest has always been attached to this work by reason of its importance as an historical authority. It has been repeatedly published separately,⁶⁸ translated into modern languages⁶⁹ and made the subject of historical research.⁷⁰ The dispute of its genuineness by Grätz scarcely deserves mention.⁷¹ This book must not be confounded with the book *de tribus virtutibus* (see above, p. 345), nor with that published by Mai, *de virtute ejusque partibus* (see above, note 10).

4. *Περὶ προνοίας. De providentia.*—The title in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 6; *Praep. evang.* vii. 20 *fin.*, viii. 13 *fin.* The work is only preserved in Armenian, and has been published by Aucher with a Latin translation.⁷² Two Greek fragments, a smaller and a very large one in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* vii. 21

⁶⁸ *Philonis Judaei lib. de virtutibus s. de legatione ad Cajum imp. graece cura*, S. F. N. Mori, Lips. 1781. Dahl, *Chrestomathia Philoniana*, 2 vols. 1800–1802. On a Paris edition of 1626 comp. Fabricius–Harles, iv. 741. Fürst, *Biblioth. Judaica*, iii. 89.

⁶⁹ *Die Gesandtschaft an den Cajus, aus dem Griechischen des Philo*, translated by Jo. Frid. Eckhard, Leipzig 1783. *Philo Judaeus, om Judarnas förföljelse under Flaccus och Legationen till Cajus Caligula, etc., öfversättin. med noter och anmerkn.*, by J. Berggren, Söderköping 1853. *Philon d'Alexandrie, écrits historiques, influence, luttres et persécutions des juifs dans le monde romain*, by F. Delaunay, 2nd ed. Paris 1870 (gives a translation of *contra Flaccum* and *Leg. ad Caj.*). On an older French translation of d'Andilly, see Fabric.–Harles, iv. 749. On an English one, Fürst, *Bibl. Jud.* iii. 91. An English translation by Yonge of Philo's entire works appeared in 4 vols. London 1854–55.

⁷⁰ Comp. above, § 17^e, and the literature there mentioned. Fabricius–Harles, *Biblioth. graec.* iv. 740 sq., and the works and articles there mentioned of Boecler, Tillemont, Ernesti and especially Jo. Christ. Gottlieb, *Animadversiones historicas et philologico-criticae ad Philonis legationem ad Cajum*, 4 pts. Meissen 1773–74. Dähne in Ersch and Gruber, art. "Philon," pp. 439–440. Bloch, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus* (1879), pp. 117–123.

⁷¹ Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 2nd ed. iii. 487–492, abridged in the 3rd ed. iii. 681. Comp. also *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1877, pp. 97 sqq., 145 sqq.

⁷² Aucher, *Philonis Judaei sermones tres*, etc. (1822) pp. 1–121. Also in Latin in Richter's hand edition (8th small vol.), and in the Tauchnitz edition (8th small vol.).

and viii. 14. The Armenian text comprises *two books*. Of these however, the first, though on the whole genuine, has at all events been preserved in only an abbreviated and in some parts a touched up form.⁷³ Eusebius seems to have been acquainted with only the second, at least both fragments belong to this book, and are introduced by Eusebius with the formula ἐν τῷ (*Sing.*) περὶ προνοίας.⁷⁴ In the *Ecclesiastical History* the reading fluctuates between τὸ περὶ προνοίας and τὰ περὶ προνοίας. There are quotations also in Johannes Damascenus and Johannes Monachus ineditus.⁷⁵

5. Ἀλέξανδρος ἡ περὶ τοῦ λόγον ἔχειν τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα (this title in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 6). *De Alexandro et quod propriam rationem muta animalia habeant* (so Jerome, *de viris illustr.* c. 11).⁷⁶—This work too is preserved only in Armenian, and has been published by Aucher.⁷⁷ Two short Greek fragments are found in the Florilegium of Leontius and Johannes.⁷⁸ The book belongs to Philo's later works, the embassy to Rome being already contemplated, p. 152 (ed. Aucher).

6. Ὑποθετικά.—Our knowledge of this work rests solely on the fragments in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 6–7, which are introduced by Eusebius with the words (viii. 5, *fin.*): Φίλωνος

⁷³ Comp. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* (1879), pp. 1–4. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), p. 340.

⁷⁴ The first fragment (vii. 21) is from the middle of the second book (Aucher, pp. 80–82); the second (viii. 14) consists of several large portions extending throughout the second book, and forming a selection from it (Aucher, pp. 44–121). The two small fragments, published by Höschel (1614), and taken by him from the Ἰωνιά of Michael apostolius (see Fabricius-Harles, v. 110 sq., ix. 758, xi. 189 sqq. Nicolai, *Griech. Litgesch.* iii. 316 sqq.), are perhaps also derived from Eusebius. See the fragments in the Frankfort ed. p. 1197 sq.; and Euseb. *Praep. evang.* ed. Gaisford, viii. 14. 2–7 and 39–41.

⁷⁵ See Mangey, ii. 684, note x.

⁷⁶ Some editions and manuscripts of Jerome have *De Alexandro dicente quod*, etc.

⁷⁷ Aucher, *Philonis Judaei sermones tres*, etc. (1822) pp. 123–172. And following him Richter (8th small vol.) and the Tauchnitz edition (8th small vol.).

⁷⁸ Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 99^b (below): ἐν τοῦ περὶ τῶν ἀλόγων ζῶων. *Ibid.* p. 100^a (above): ἐν τοῦ αὐτοῦ.

. . . ἀπὸ τοῦ πρώτου συγγράμματος ὃν ἐπέγραψεν Ἑποθετικῶν, ἔνθα τὸν ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων ὡς πρὸς κατηγοροὺς αὐτῶν ποιούμενος λόγον ταῦτά φησιν. The title does not signify "suppositions concerning the Jews,"⁷⁹ but, as Bernays has pointed out, "counsels, recommendations." For Ἑποθετικοὶ λόγοι are such dissertations as contain moral counsels or recommendations, in contradistinction to theoretical investigations of ethic questions. Philo, as the preserved fragments already show, has devoted the main point of his work to the discussion of such Jewish precepts as he could *recommend* to the obedience of a non-Jewish circle of readers, to whom the work is unmistakeably directed.⁸⁰ As the work pursues apologetic aims, we might be inclined to regard it as identical with the *Apologia pro Judaeis* to be forthwith mentioned, but that Eusebius distinguishes the two by different titles.

7. Περὶ Ἰουδαίων.—This title in Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 18. 6. Ἡ ὑπὲρ Ἰουδαίων ἀπολογία, from which Eusebius (*Praep. evang.* viii. 11) borrows the description of the Essenes, is certainly identical with this work. The conjecture of Dähne, that the piece *de nobilitate* (Mangey, ii. 437–444) also belongs to this work is not improbable.⁸¹ It treats of true nobility *i.e.* of the wisdom and virtue, of which the Jewish nation also was not devoid, and is therefore a very suitable element in an apology for the Jews. The genuineness of the ἀπολογία has been recently disputed by Hilgenfeld (see above, note 58).

V. The last-named works are only known to us by fragments, but the following books, most of which have been already mentioned in this survey, are *entirely lost*. (1) Of the *Quaestiones et solutiones*, two books on Genesis and more

⁷⁹ So Ewald, vi. 304. Comp. also Grossmann, i. p. 16.

⁸⁰ Bernays, "Philon's Hypothesika und die Verwünschungen des Buzyges in Athen" (*Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1876, pp. 589–609; reprinted in Bernays, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1885, i. 262–282. Comp. especially p. 599).

⁸¹ Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, pp. 990, 1037. In the article "Philon" in Ersch and Grüber, p. 440, Dähne again expresses this conjecture.

than three on Exodus (see above, p. 327). (2) Two books of the *Legum allegoriae* (see above, p. 332). (3) The first book *περὶ μέθης* (see p. 335). (4) Both the books *περὶ διαθηκῶν* (see p. 337). (5) Three of the five books *de somniis* (see p. 337). (6) The two biographies of Isaac and Jacob (see p. 342). (7) The work *περὶ τοῦ δοῦλον εἶναι πάντα φαῦλον* (see p. 349). (8) The first, second and fifth books of the work on the persecutions of the Jews under Caligula (see p. 350). (9) A work *περὶ ἀριθμῶν*, to which Philo refers in the *Vita Mosis* and elsewhere.⁸³ (10) A dialogue between Isaac and Ishmael on the difference between true wisdom and sophism, of which it is not indeed certain, whether Philo wrote or only intended to write it.⁸⁴ (11) According to a remark in *Quod omnis probus liber*, Philo intended to write a disquisition "On the government of the wise."⁸⁴ We do not know whether this intention was carried out. (12) In the *Florilegium* of Leontius and Johannes a small piece is cited *ἐκ τῶν περὶ τοῦ ἱεροῦ*.⁸⁵ Can a work known to us under some other name be intended?

VI. The following supposed works of Philo are now pretty generally regarded as spurious:—

1. *Περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἢ ἱκετῶν ἀρετῶν. De vita contemplativa* (Mangey, ii. 471–486).—Eusebius twice cites the

⁸³ *Vita Mosis*, lib. iii. § 11 (Mang. ii. 152): ἔχει δὲ καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀμνηστίας ἀρετὰς ἢ τετραῖς, ὧν τὰς πλείους ἡκριβώσαμεν ἐν τῇ περὶ ἀριθμῶν πραγματείᾳ.—*Quaest. et solut. in Genes.* ed. Aucher, p. 381: jam dictum fuit in libro, in quo de numeris actum est. Comp. the same, pp. 224, 359. Grossmann, i. p. 24. In the work *de opificio mundi* Philo refers to a dissertation on the number four as one yet to be written, p. 11, Mang.: πολλὰς δὲ καὶ ἄλλας κίχρηται δυνάμεις ἢ τετραῖς αἷς ἀκριβέστερον καὶ ἐν τῇ περὶ αὐτῆς ἰδίῳ λόγῳ προσυποδικνίον. If this is identical with the work *περὶ ἀριθμῶν*, it would follow, that the *Vita Mosis* was a later work than de *opificio mundi*. Comp. Grossmann, ii. p. 6.

⁸⁴ *De sobrietate*, § 2 (Mang. i. 394 above): Σοφίαν μὲν γὰρ Ἰσαὰκ, σοφιστίαν δὲ Ἰσμαὴλ κακλήρωται, ὡς, ἱππιδῶν ὑπώτερον χαρακτηρίζομεν, ἐν τισὶ διαλόγοις ἐπιδείκνυμεν. Comp. Grossmann, i. p. 25.

⁸⁵ *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 3 (Mang. ii. 448): Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ σοφοῦ λόγος εἰς καιρὸν ἐπιτηδύστερον ὑπερκρίσθω. Comp. Grossmann, i. p. 25.

⁸⁶ Mai, *Script. vet. nov. coll.* vii. 1, p. 103a.

title in the following form (*H. E.* ii. 17. 3 and ii. 18. 7): *περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ ἢ ἱκετῶν*. The *ἀρετῶν* added at the end must therefore be expunged. Eusebius, *H. E.* ii. 17, gives full information concerning the contents, comp. also ii. 16. 2. This composition has, since the time of Eusebius, enjoyed special approbation in the Christian Church, Christian monks being almost universally recognised in the "Therapeutae" here described and glorified.⁸⁶ The likeness is indeed surprising; but for that very reason the suspicion is also well founded, that the author's design, was under the mask of Philo to recommend Christian monachism. But apart from this there are other suspicious elements, by reason of which even such critics as do not regard the Therapeutae as representing a Christian, but as a Jewish ideal of life, have denied the authorship of Philo.⁸⁷ Upon the ground of the identification of the Therapeutae with Christian monks, Lucius, after the precedent of Grätz and Jost,⁸⁸ has declared this composition spurious.⁸⁹ It is by his thorough and methodical investigation that the spuriousness of its authorship has been definitely decided.⁹⁰

⁸⁶ Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 104 forms an exception: 'Ανεγνώσθησαν δὲ καὶ τῶν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις Φιλοσοφούντων τὴν τε θεωρητικὴν καὶ τὴν πρακτικὴν φιλοσοφίαν βίος ὃν μὲν Ἑσθηνοὶ οἱ δὲ θεραπευταὶ ἐκαλοῦντο κ.τ.λ. Epiphanius, *Haer.* 29. 5, quotes this composition with the formula *ἐν τῇ περὶ Ἰουδαίων αἰντοῦ ἐπιγραφομένη βίβλῳ*, but is nevertheless of opinion that it treats of Christians. Compare the *testimonia veterum* before Mangey's edition and the literature in Fabricius-Harles, iv. 738 sq. Of this older literature must be specially mentioned Montfaucon's French translation, furnished with valuable notes, *Le livre de Philon de la vie contemplative etc.*, traduit sur l'original grec, avec des observations, ou l'on fait voir, que les Therapeutes, dont il parle, étoient Chrétiens, Paris 1709. The texts of an old and of a more recent Latin version are given by Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. 322-331.

⁸⁷ Especially Nicolas, *Revue de Théologie*, Strasbourg 1868, p. 25 sqq., and Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israël*, ii. 440-444. Also Weingarten, art. "Mönchtum," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. 761-764.

⁸⁸ Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 2nd ed. iii. 463 sqq. Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, i. 214, note 2.

⁸⁹ Lucius, *Die Therapeuten und ihre Stellung in der Geschichte der Askese, eine kritische Untersuchung der Schrift de vita contemplativa*, Strassburg 1879.

⁹⁰ Comp. also my notice of Lucius in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1880,

2. *Περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου. De incorruptibilitate mundi* (Mangey, ii. 487–516).—This composition is regarded as genuine by Grossmann and Dähne.⁹¹ But even the transmission of the manuscripts and the external testimony are unfavourable to its genuineness,⁹² which since the investigations of Bernays has been generally given up. Bernays has also especially shown, that the traditional text has fallen into disorder through the transposition of the pages.⁹³ He has published the text in Greek and German according to the order restored by himself,⁹⁴ and furnished it with a commentary.⁹⁵ Bücheler gives emendations of Bernays' text.⁹⁶ Zeller attempts to show that the composition has been touched up.⁹⁷

3. *Περὶ κόσμου. De mundo* (Mangey, ii. 601–624).—The spuriousness of this work has long been acknowledged.⁹⁸ It

pp. 111–118. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1880, pp. 423–440. Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), p. 307. For its genuineness also Delaunay, *Revue archéologique*, new series, vol. xxii. (1870–71) pp. 268–282, xxvi. (1873) pp. 12–22. The same, *Moines et sibylles dans l'antiquité judéo-grecque* 1874, pp. 11–51. Bestmann, *Gesch. der christlichen Sitte*, vol. i. (1880) p. 183 sqq.

⁹¹ Grossmann, i. p. 21. Dähne in Ersch and Gruber, art. "Philon," p. 441.

⁹² Mangey remarks of this composition (ii. 487, note): *desert in maxima parte codicum, nec recensetur in indiculis Eusebii Hieronymi Photii et Suidae.*

⁹³ Bernays, "Ueber die Herstellung des Zusammenhanges in der unter Philo's Namen gehenden Schrift *περὶ ἀφθαρσίας κόσμου* durch Blätterversetzung" (*Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie*, 1863, pp. 34–40; reprinted in Bernays, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1885, i. 283–290).

⁹⁴ Bernays, "Die unter Philon's Werken stehende Schrift über die Unzerstörbarkeit des Weltalls nach ihrer ursprünglichen Anordnung wiederhergestellt und ins Deutsche übertragen" (*Transactions of the Berlin Academy*, 1876, *phil.-hist. class.*, pp. 209–278). Also separately.

⁹⁵ Bernays, "Ueber die unter Philon's Werken stehende Schrift über die Unzerstörbarkeit des Weltalls" (*Transactions of the Berlin Academy*, 1882, *phil.-hist. class.*, Tr. iii. p. 82). Also separately. The commentary has been published by Usener as a posthumous work of Bernays.

⁹⁶ Bücheler, *Philonea* (*Rhein. Museum*, vol. xxxii. 1877, pp. 433–444).

⁹⁷ Zeller, *Der pseudophilonische Bericht über Theophrast* (*Hermes*, vol. xv. 1880, pp. 137–146).

⁹⁸ Wilh. Budäus, who translated it into Latin (1526), already acknowledged

is a collection of extracts from other works of Philo, especially from the composition *de incorruptibilitate mundi*.⁹⁹

4. *De Sampson* (Aucher, *Paralipomena Armena*, 1826, pp. 549–577).—*De Jona* (Aucher, pp. 578–611).—A general agreement prevails as to the spuriousness of these two discourses, which are published in Armenian and Latin by Aucher.¹⁰⁰

5. *Interpretatio Hebraicorum nominum*. Origen, *Comment. in Joann.* vol. ii. c. 27 (*Opp.* ed. Lommatzsch, i. 150), mentions an apparently anonymous work on this subject: *εὐρομεν τοῖσιν ἐν τῇ ἐρμηνείᾳ τῶν ὀνομάτων*. Eusebius says, that it is ascribed to Philo, but the manner in which he speaks of it plainly shows, that he was only acquainted with the work as an anonymous one, *H. E.* ii. 18. 7: *καὶ τῶν ἐν νόμῳ δὲ καὶ προφήταις Ἑβραϊκῶν ὀνομάτων αἱ ἐρμηνεῖαι τοῦ αὐτοῦ σπουδαὶ εἶναι λέγονται*. Jerome says, that according to the testimony of Origen, Philo was the author. Hence he evidently saw the work only in an anonymous copy. He himself desired to translate it into Latin, but found the text so barbarized, that he considered it necessary to undertake an entirely new work.¹⁰¹ In the preface he expresses himself concerning the history of these Onomastica as follows: Philo, vir disertissimus Judaeorum, Origenis quoque testimonio conprobatur edidisse librum hebraicorum nominum eorumque etymologias juxta ordinem litterarum e latere copulasse. Qui cum vulgo habeatur a Graecis et bibliothecas orbis inpleverit, studii mihi fuit in latinam eum linguam vertere. Verum tam

its spuriousness. Comp. also Mangey, ii. 601, note. Fabricius-Harles, iv. 742. Grossmann, i. p. 21. Dähne in Ersch and Grüber, art. "Philon."

⁹⁹ See the parallels pointed out in Grossmann, i. p. 28.

¹⁰⁰ The text is also given in Richter's and the Tauchnitz editions. Comp. generally: Dähne, *Stud. und Krit.* 1833, pp. 987–989. Freudenthal, *Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift über die Herrschaft der Vernunft* (Fourth Book of Maccabees), 1869, pp. 9–12, 141–147. Grossmann, i. p. 21, does not express himself quite decidedly on the question of genuineness.

¹⁰¹ This Onomasticon of Jerome (*über interpretationis hebraicorum nominum*) is in Vallarsi's edition of Jerome's works, vol. iii. 1–120, and in Lagarde, *Onomastica sacra* (1870), pp. 1–81.

dissona inter se exemplaria repperi et sic confusum ordinem, ut tacere melius judicaverim quam reprehensione quid dignum scribere. Itaque singula per ordinem scripturarum volumina percucurri et vetus aedificium nova cura instaurans fecisse me reor quod a Graecis quoque adpetendum sit. . . . Ac ne forte consummato aedificio quasi extrema deesset manus, novi testamenti verba et nomina interpretatus sum, imitari volens ex parte Origenem, quem post apostolos ecclesiarum magistrum nemo nisi inperitus negat. Inter cetera enim ingeni sui praeclara monimenta etiam in hoc laboravit, ut quod Philo quasi Judaeus omiserat hic ut christianus inpleret. According to this account of Jerome it must certainly be admitted, that Origen already considered Philo to be the author. But the work being anonymous his testimony is not sufficient, and the question of authorship cannot be decided on internal grounds, because the work is no longer extant in its most ancient form.¹⁰² A tolerably copious list of Philonian etymologies may be collected from those works of Philo which have been preserved.¹⁰³

6. On a Latin work *de biblicis antiquitatibus*, ascribed to Philo, see Fabricius-Harles, iv. 743, and especially Pitra, *Analecta sacra*, ii. 298 sq., 319–322. The pseudo-Philonian *Breviarum temporum*, a forgery of Annianus of Viterbo (Fabricius-Harles, *l.c.*), must not be confounded with this. On the treatise *de virtute ejusque partibus*, published by Mai under Philo's name, see above, note 10.

¹⁰² For various Greek and Latin Onomastica of scriptural names, see Vallarsi, *Hieronymi Opp.* iii. 537 sqq., and Lagarde, *Onomastica sacra*, p. 161 sqq. The work *de nominibus Hebraicis* (see above, note 21), printed under Philo's name in the Basle collection of certain works of Philo, is simply the Onomasticon of Jerome. Comp. on this whole literature, Fabricius-Harles, *Bibliotheca graeca*, iv. 742 sq., vi. 199 sqq., vii. 226 sq.

¹⁰³ Such collections are found in Vallarsi, *Hieronymi Opp.* iii. 731–744, and in Siegfried, *Philonische Studien* (Merx' Archiv, ii. 2. 143–163).

II. THE DOCTRINE OF PHILO.

*The Literature.*¹⁰⁴

- Stahl, "Versuch eines systematischen Entwurfs des Lehrbegriffs Philo's von Alexandrien" (Eichhorn's *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur*, vol. iv. paragraph 5, 1793, pp. 765-890).
- Grossmann, *Questiones Philonae*. I. *De theologiae Philonis fontibus et auctoritate quaestionis primae particula prima*. II. *De λόγῳ Philonis. Quaestio altera*. Lips. 1829.
- Gfrörer, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie* (also under the title *Kritische Geschichte des Urchristenthums*), 2 vols. Stuttgart 1831.
- Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*, 2 vols. Halle 1834. Comp. also his art. "Philon" in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopädie*.
- Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, vol. iv. (1834), pp. 418-492.
- Georgii, "Ueber die neuesten Gegensätze in Auffassung der Alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie, insbesondere des Jüdischen Alexandrinismus" (*Zeitschr. für die histor. Theol.* 1839, No. 3, pp. 3-98, No. 4, pp. 3-98).
- Lücke, *Commentar über das Evang. des Johannes*, vol. i. (3rd ed. 1840) p. 272 sqq.
- Kefenstein, *Philo's Lehre von den göttlichen Mittelwesen, zugleich eine kurze Darstellung der Grundzüge des philonischen Systems*, Leipzig 1846.
- Bucher, *Philonische Studien*, Tübingen 1848.
- Niedner, *De subsistentia τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ apud Philonem tributa quaestionis*, Parts i. ii. Lips. 1848, 1849 (also in the *Zeitsch. für die histor. Theol.* 1849).
- Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, vol. i. (1852) pp. 418-446.
- Dorner, *Entwicklungsgesch. der Lehre von der Person Christi*, vol. i. pp. 21-57.
- Wolff, *Die philonische Philosophie in ihren Hauptmomenten dargestellt*, 2nd ed. 1858.
- Joel, "Ueber einige geschichtliche Beziehungen des philonischen Systems" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1863, pp. 19-31).

¹⁰⁴ For the older literature see Fabricius-Harles, iv. 721-727. Comp. also Freudenthal, "Zur Geschichte der Anschauungen über die jüdisch-hellenistische Religionsphilosophie" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1869, pp. 399-421).

- Frankel, "Zur Ethik des jüdisch-alexandrinischen Philosophen Philo" (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1867, pp. 241-252, 281-297).
- Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, i. 208-225.
- Lipsius, art. "Alexandrinische Religionsphilosophie," in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* i. 85-99.
- Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Part iii. Div. 2 (3rd ed. 1881), pp. 338-418.
- Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie* (1872), pp. 204-297.
- Stein, *Sieben Bücher zur Geschichte des Platonismus*, Part iii. (1875) pp. 8-17.
- Soulier, *La doctrine du Logos chez Philon d'Alexandrie*, Turin 1876 (comp. *Theol. Litzg.* 1877, 101).
- Révillé, *Le Logos d'après Philon d'Alexandrie*, Genève 1877 (see Bursian's *Philol. Jahresber.* xxi. 35 sq.). The same, *La doctrine du Logos dans le quatrième évangile et dans les oeuvres de Philon*, Paris 1881.
- Nicolas, "Etudes sur Philon d'Alexandrie" (*Revue de l'histoire des religions*, vol. v. 1882, pp. 318-339; vol. vii. 1883, pp. 145-164; vol. viii. 1883, pp. 468-488, 582-602, 756-772).
- Comp. also the works and articles mentioned above, p. 321 sq., of Steinhart, J. G. Müller, Ewald, Ueberweg, Hausrath, Siegfried, Hamburger, Zöckler.

The survey already given of Philo's works is sufficient to show the many-sidedness of his culture and of his literary efforts. That which applies to the representatives of Judæo-Hellenism in general, viz. that they combined in themselves both *Jewish and Hellenic* culture, is pre-eminently true of him. It must be admitted, that *Greek philosophy* comes the most prominently into the foreground.¹⁰⁵ He was a man saturated with every means of culture afforded in his age by the schools of the Greeks. His diction was formed by the Greek classical authors; and especially "may the influence of Plato's works upon Philo in even a lexical and phraseological respect be called very considerable."¹⁰⁶ He was intimately acquainted with the great Greek poets Homer,

¹⁰⁵ Comp. on this and especially on Philo's linguistic culture, Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria*, pp. 31-141. Also Zeller, iii. 2. 343 sqq.

¹⁰⁶ Siegfried, *Philo*, p. 32.

Euripides and others, whom he occasionally quotes.¹⁰⁷ But it is the philosophers whom he most highly esteems. He calls Plato "the great;"¹⁰⁸ Parmenides, Empedocles, Zeno, Cleanthes are in his eyes divine men and form a sacred society.¹⁰⁹ But it is his own view of the world and of life, which shows more than aught else how highly he esteemed the Greek philosophers. It agrees in the most essential points with the great teachers of the Greeks. Nay, Philo has so profoundly absorbed their doctrines and so peculiarly worked them up into a new whole, as himself to belong to the series of Greek philosophers. His system may on the whole be entitled an eclectic one, Platonic, Stoic, and Neo-Pythagorean doctrines being the most prominent. Just in proportion as now one now the other was embraced, has he been designated at one time a *Platonist*, at another a *Pythagorean*.¹¹⁰ He might just as correctly be called a Stoic, for the influence of Stoicism was at least as strong upon him as that of Platonism or Neo-Pythagoreanism.¹¹¹

Notwithstanding however this profound appropriation of

¹⁰⁷ A list of Greek classics quoted by Philo is given by Grossmann, *Quaestiones Philonae*, i. p. 5. Siegfried, *Philo*, p. 137 sqq.

¹⁰⁸ *De providentia*, ii. 42, p. 77, ed. Aucher (Richter, 8th small vol.). Comp. also *Quod omnis probus liber*, ii. 447, Mangey (Richter, 5th small vol.), where, according to the *cod. Mediceus* (one of the best manuscripts), τὸν ἱερώτατον Πλάτωνα is the reading instead of τὸν λιγυρώτατον Πλάτωνα.

¹⁰⁹ *De providentia*, ii. 48, p. 79, ed. Aucher (Richter, 8th small vol.): Parmenides, Empedocles, Zeno, Cleanthes aliique divi homines ac velut verus quidam proprieque sacer coetus. Comp. *Quod omnis probus liber*, ii. 444, Mang. (Richter, 5th small vol.): τὸν τῶν Πυθαγορείων ἱερώτατον θάσαν.

¹¹⁰ A Platonist in the well-known proverb: ἢ Πλάτων φιλονίξει ἢ Φίλων πλατωνίξει (Hieronymus, *vir. illustr.* c. 11. Suidas, *Lex. s.v.* Φίλων. Photius, *Bibliotheca cod.* 105). Clemens Alex. calls him a Pythagorean, and that in the two passages in which he is characterizing his philosophical tendency, *Strom.* i. 15. 72: διὰ πολλῶν ὁ Πυθαγόρειος ὑποδείκνυσσι Φίλων. *Strom.* ii. 19, 100: ὡς φησιν ὁ Πυθαγόρειος Φίλων. Eusebius brings forward both his Platonism and his Pythagoreanism, *H. E.* ii. 4. 3: μέλιστα τὴν κατὰ Πλάτωνα καὶ Πυθαγόραν ἱζηλωκὴς ἀγωγὴν.

¹¹¹ Zeller and Heinze in particular have pointed out the strong influence of Stoicism. Stein in opposition to them seeks to lay more stress on Platonism. But comp. Heinze, *Theol. Litztg.* 1877, 112 (in the discussion on Stein's *Geschichte des Platonismus*).

Greek philosophy, Philo remained *a Jew*: and the wisdom of the Greeks did not make him unfaithful to the religion of his fathers. Nor must his *Jewish education* be depreciated in presence of the philosophical culture, which certainly appears the more prominent.¹¹² He was *not indeed fluent* in the *Hebrew tongue*, and he read the Old Testament exclusively in the Greek translation. Still he had a respectable knowledge of Hebrew, as is shown by his numerous etymologies, which indeed often appear absurd to us, but are in truth not worse than those of the Palestinian Rabbis.¹¹³ He had indeed no accurate knowledge of the Palestinian Halachah. But that he had a general acquaintance with it is proved, not only by a single decided intimation,¹¹⁴ but especially by his whole work *de specialibus legibus*.¹¹⁵ In the *Haggadic interpretation of Scripture* he was quite a master. For the whole of his allegorical commentary is with respect to form nothing else than a transference of the method of the Palestinian Midrash to the region of Hellenism. It is just by this means that Philo gains the possibility of showing, that his philosophical doctrine already exists in the Old Testament. Many close approximations are also found with respect to substance, though these are much slighter than the agreement in method.¹¹⁶ For his legendary embellishment of the life of Moses, Philo expressly appeals to the tradition of the *πρεσβύτεροι*, who "always combined oral tradition with what was read aloud."¹¹⁷

¹¹² Comp. Siegfried, pp. 142-159.

¹¹³ Comp. the collections of Vallarsi and Siegfried named above (note 108).

¹¹⁴ Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 7. 6 (from the first book of the *Hypothetica*). Philo having here given by way of example a series of commands, says there are also *μυρία ἄλλα ἐπὶ ταῖς, ὅσα καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγράφων ἰδῶν καὶ νομίζων, καὶ τοῖς νομίμοις αὐτοῖς*.

¹¹⁵ See above, p. 348, and Ritter's work, *Philo und die Halacha*, 1879, there named; also Siegfried, p. 145.

¹¹⁶ Comp. Siegfried, p. 145 sqq. Also much in Frankel, *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (1851), especially pp. 190-200.

¹¹⁷ *Vita Mosis*, lib. i. § 1 (Mang. ii. 81): 'Ἀλλ' ἔγωγε . . . τὰ περὶ τὸς

Philo has nowhere given a systematic statement of his system. He has at most developed single points, such as the doctrine of the creation of the world with some degree of connection. As a rule he gives the ideas he has worked out, in conjunction with the text of the Old Testament. This is consistent with the *formal principle* of his whole theology, viz. the assumption of the absolute authority of the Mosaic law. The Thorah of Moses is to him, as to every Jew, the supreme, nay the sole and absolutely decisive authority: a perfect revelation of Divine wisdom. Every word written in Holy Scripture by Moses is a divine declaration.¹¹⁸ Hence no word in it is without definite meaning.¹¹⁹ The Scriptures also of the other prophets in conjunction with those of Moses contain Divine revelations. For all the prophets are God's interpreters, who makes use of them as instruments for the revelation of the Divine will.¹²⁰ With this formal principle

ἄνδρα μηνύσω, μαθὼν αὐτὰ καὶ ἐκ βίβλων τῶν ἱερῶν . . . καὶ παρὰ τινων ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθνους πρεσβυτέρων. Τὰ γὰρ λεγόμενα τοῖς ἀναγινωσκομένοις αἰεὶ συνύφαινον.

¹¹⁸ *Vita Mosis*, ii. 163, ed. Mangey (Richter, 4th small vol.): Οὐκ ἀγνοῶ μὲν οὖν, ὡς πάντα εἰσι χρησμοὶ ὅσα ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις ἀναγίγνεται χρησθέντες δι' αὐτοῦ (scil. Μωϋσέως).

¹¹⁹ In *De profugis*, i. 554, Mangey (Richter, 3rd small vol.), we are told of Philo, that the expression θανάτῃ θανατοῦσθαι instead of the simple θανατοῦσθαι, Ex. xxi. 12, disquieted him, because he well knew, ὅτι περὶ τὸν ὄνομα οὐδὲν τίθησιν.—For other examples see *De Cherubim*, i. 149, Mangey (Richter, 1st small vol.). *De agricultura Noe*, i. 300, Mangey (Richter, 2nd small vol.).

¹²⁰ The extent of Philo's *Canon* cannot be defined as to details. It is quite certain, that the Thorah of Moses has in his view quite a different importance to the rest of Holy Scripture. But the latter also, i.e. the most important of the Nebiim and Kethubim, are quoted by him as prophetic and sacred writings. For further particulars see Gfrörer, i. 46 sqq. On the inspiration of the prophets see *De monarchia*, ii. 222, Mang. (Richter, 4th small vol.): προφήτης θεοφόρητος θεσπισὶ καὶ προφητεύει, λέγων μὲν οἰκίαν οὐδὲν οὐδὲ γὰρ, εἰ λέγει, δύναται καταλαβεῖν ὅτι κατεχόμενος ὅτως καὶ ἰσθυσίων. Ὅσα δὲ ἐπηχίται, διελίσσεται καθάπερ ὑποβάλλοτος ἵππου. Ἐρμηνεῖς γὰρ εἰσι οἱ προφῆται τοῦ καταχρημένου τοῖς ἱερεῦσι ὀργάνους πρὸς δόξωσιν ἢ ἢν ἰδιότης. Comp. also *De specialibus legibus*, ii. 343, Mangey (Richter, 5th small vol.). *Quis rerum divinarum heres*. i. 511, Mangey (Richter, 3rd small vol.). For more on Philo's doctrine of inspiration see Gfrörer, i. 54-68.

of the absolute authority of Holy Scripture and especially of the Mosaic law, is connected the further assumption that all true wisdom was actually contained just in this source of all knowledge. In other words, Philo deduces formally from the Old Testament all those philosophical doctrines which he had in fact appropriated from the Greek philosophers. Not in Plato, Pythagoras and Zeno, but above all in the writings of Moses, is to be found the deepest and most perfect instruction concerning things divine and human. In them was already comprised all that was good and true, which the Greek philosophers subsequently taught. Thus Moses is the true teacher of mankind, and it is from him—as Philo, like Aristobulus, presupposes—that the Greek philosophers derived their wisdom.¹²¹

The scientific means by which it was possible for Philo to adhere to and carry out these assumptions is *allegorical interpretation*.¹²² This was no invention of Philo, but one which had already been perfected and wielded by others.¹²³ Hence it was for him a quite self-evident process, which he nowhere thought it necessary to justify, although he occasionally extols its value and declares it indispensable. By the help of this process he was able to read out of the primitive history of Genesis those profound philosophical theories, especially in the department of Psychology and Ethic, which really grew up in the soil of Greek philosophy. The most external occurrences of scriptural history become in his hands mines of instruction concerning the supreme problems of human existence.

Only by means of this method could the *double mission* be in fact fulfilled which Philo saw allotted to him. He thus became to his Jewish co-religionists, with whom he shared the presupposition of the Divine authority of the Mosaic

¹²¹ So Heraclitus (*Leg. allegor.* i. 65, Mang., Richter, 1st small vol. *Quis rerum divinarum heres.* i. 508, Mang., Richter, 3rd small vol.). Zeno (*Quod omnis probus liber.* ii. 454, Mang., Richter, 5th small vol.).

¹²² Comp. Gfrörer, i. 68–113. Zeller, iii. 2. 346–352; and especially Siegfried, *Philo*, pp. 160–197.

¹²³ Zeller, iii. 2. 265 sq.

law, the medium of the philosophic culture of the Greeks; showing them, that Moses had taught just what appeared to him true and valuable in Greek philosophy. On the other hand he proved to the Greeks by the same means, that all the knowledge and intuition, for which they so highly esteemed their own philosophers, were already to be found in the writings of Moses. It was not they but Moses, who was both the best of lawgivers and the first and greatest of philosophers. These two tendencies are, it may be plainly perceived, the mainsprings of Philo's extensive literary activity. Being himself both *Jew* and *Greek* he desired to act upon both, to make the Jews Greeks and the Greeks Jews. His religious assumptions are in the first place those of Judaism with its belief in revelation. But these religious assumptions underwent a powerful and peculiar modification by the elements which he derived from the Greek philosophy. And as he combined both in himself, he desired to set up a propaganda on both sides.

No strictly completed *system of Philo* can in truth be spoken of. The elements, of which his view of the world is compounded, are too heterogeneous to form a strictly completed unity. Nevertheless his several views exhibit a connected whole, whose members mutually condition one another. In the following attempt to give a brief sketch of this whole, we shall leave out of consideration his specifically Jewish assumptions and confine ourselves to his philosophical views. The characteristic feature of his standpoint is just this, that his philosophy, i.e. his entire view of the world, may be completely stated without the necessity of mentioning any Jewish, particularistic notions. *His Judaism virtually consists in the formal claim, that the Jewish people are by reason of the Mosaic revelation in possession of the highest religious knowledge—one might almost say of the true religious illumination. In a material respect Greek views have gained the upper hand.* For even his theology is only so far Jewish as to insist on monotheism and on the worship of God apart

from images. In this however it stands in opposition only to the polytheism of the heathen *religions*, but not to the idea of God of Greek *philosophy*, which on the contrary Philo very closely follows. Thus his Judaism is already very powerfully modified. Moreover the specifically Jewish, *i.e.* the particularistic notions are embraced by him in a form which is tantamount to their denial. It is just this which makes it possible, entirely to disregard them in a sketch of his view of the world.¹²⁴—The following survey follows chiefly the excellent exposition of Zeller, certainly the best we now have.

1. *The Doctrine of God.*¹²⁵ The fundamental thought from which Philo starts, is that of the dualism of God and the world. God alone is good and perfect, the finite as such is imperfect. All determinations, which are adapted to finite existence, are therefore to be denied of God. He is eternal, unchangeable, simple, free, self-sufficing.¹²⁶ He is not only

¹²⁴ With regard to detail the following remarks may suffice. Philo firmly adheres to the *obligation of the Mosaic law*. But only because it is in his eyes the most perfect, just and reasonable, because its moral demands are always the purest, its social institutions the best and most humane, its religious ceremonies the most consistent with the Divine intelligence. In this sense it is that he exhibits it in his work *de specialibus legibus*. He also adheres to the *prerogative of the Jewish people*: the Jews are the privileged people of God (Gfrörer, i. 486 sq. Dähne, i. 428 sq.). But they owe their privileges to their own and their forefathers' virtues. God makes no distinction between men as such. Hence too the *Messianic promise*, *i.e.* the promise of earthly prosperity, to which also Philo adheres (see § 29), applies not to Israel according to the flesh, but to all who are converted from idolatry to the only true God (see especially *de execrationibus*, § 8, Mang. ii. 436). We see that Jewish particularism is here everywhere in course of dissolution. Judaism is on the contrary the best religion just because it is cosmopolitan (comp. below, note 179).

¹²⁵ Comp. Gfrörer, i. 118 sqq. Dähne, i. 114 sqq. Zeller, iii. 2, pp. 353–360.

¹²⁶ *Eternal*, *ἀίδιος*, *De mundi opificio*, i. 3, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 5); *De caritate*, ii. 386, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 5), and elsewhere. *Unchangeable*, *ἀτρεπτος*, *De Cherubim*, i. 142, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1); *Legum allegoriarum*, i. 53, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1), and the whole work *Quod deus sit immutabilis*, i. 272 sqq., Mang. (Richter, small vol. 2).—*Simple*, *ἀπλοῦς*, *Legum allegor.* i. 66, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1).—*Free*, *De*

free from human faults, but exalted above all human virtues, He is better than the good and the beautiful.¹²⁷ Nay, since every determination would be a limitation, He is devoid of qualities *ἄποιος*, without a *ποιότης*,¹²⁸ and thus His nature is undefinable. We can only say that He is, not what He is.¹²⁹—It is true that together with these purely negative definitions, which advance almost to an absence of attributes, is found also a series of positive assertions on the nature of God, by which assertions of the former kind are again abolished. This contradiction however is not to be wondered at. For the object of this assertion of an absence of attributes is merely to remove all limitation, all imperfection from God. And therefore Philo makes no difficulty in placing beside it the other assertion: that *all perfection is combined* in God and derived from Him, He fills and comprises everything.¹³⁰ All

somniis, i. 692, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3).—*Self-sufficing*, *χρῆζων οὐδενός τὸ παράπαν*, *ἑαυτῷ ἰκανός, αὐταρκέστατος ἑαυτῷ*, *Legum allegor.* i. 66, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1); *De mutatione nominum*, i. 582, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3); *De fortitudine*, ii. 377, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 5).

¹²⁷ *De mundi opificio*, i. 2, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): *ὁ τῶν ὅλων νοῦς — εὐκρινέστατος καὶ ἀκραιφνέστατος, κρείττων τε ἢ ἀρετῇ καὶ κρείττων ἢ ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ κρείττων ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν.*

¹²⁸ *Legum allegorizae*, i. 50, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): *ἄποιος—ὁ θεός.—Ibid.* i. 53: *ὁ γὰρ ἡ ποιότης οὐκ ἔχει τὸν θεὸν ἢ μὴ ἵνα εἴναι ἢ μὴ ἀγνύνητον καὶ ἀφθαρτον ἢ μὴ ἀτρέπτον, ἑαυτὸν ἀδικεῖ οὐ θεόν.—Quod deus sit immutabilis*, i. 281, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 2): God must be withdrawn from all determination (quality) (*ἐκβιβάζειν—πάσης ποιότητος*).

¹²⁹ *Vita Mosii*, ii. 92, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 4): *Ὁ δὲ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον λέγει, Φησὶν, αὐτοῖς: Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ὢν, ἵνα μαθόντες διαφορὰν ὄντος τε καὶ μὴ ὄντος προσαναδιδραχθῶσιν, ὥς οὐδὲν ὄνομα ἐπ' ἑμοῦ τὸ παράπαν κυριολογεῖται, ἢ μόνον πρόσσιτι τὸ εἶναι.—Quod deus sit immutabilis*, i. 282, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 2): *ὁ δ' ἄρα οὐδὲ τῷ ᾧ καταληπτός, ὅτι μὴ κατὰ τὸ εἶναι μόνον. Ὑπαρξίς γάρ ἐσθ' ὁ καταλαμβανόμενος αὐτοῦ, τὸ δὲ χωρὶς ὑπάρξεως οὐδὲν.—De mutatione nominum*, i. 580, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3).—*De somniis*, i. 655, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3).

¹³⁰ *Legum allegorizae*, i. 52, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): *τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἐσιδεῖ καὶ ἔρημα καὶ κενὰ ὄντα πληρῶν καὶ περιέχων, αὐτὸς δὲ ὑπ' οὐδενός ἄλλου περιεχόμενος, ὅτι εἰς καὶ τὸ πᾶν αὐτὸς ὢν.—Ibid.* i. 88, Mang.: *Πάντα γὰρ πεπληρώκειν ὁ θεός, καὶ διὰ πάντων διελήλυθεν, καὶ κενὸν οὐδὲ ἔρημον ἀποδείλπειν ἑαυτοῦ.—Ibid.* i. 97, Mang.—*De confusione linguarum*, i. 425 Mang. (Richter, small vol. 2).—*De migratione Abrahami*, i. 466,

perfection in the creature is derived solely and only from Him.¹³¹

2. *The Intermediate Beings.*¹³² God, as the absolutely Perfect, cannot enter into direct contact with matter. All contact therewith would defile Him.¹³³ An acting therefore of God upon the world and in the world is according to Philo only possible through the intervention of intermediate causes, of interposing powers who establish an intercourse between God and the world. For the more precise definition of these intermediate beings, four notions, suited to this purpose, offered themselves to Philo; two belonging to the philosophical, two to the religious region. These were the *Platonic* doctrine of *ideas*, the *Stoic* doctrine of *active causes*, the *Jewish* doctrine of *angels*, and the *Greek* doctrine of *daemons*. All these elements, but chiefly the Stoic doctrine of powers, were used by Philo in constructing his peculiar doctrine of intermediate beings. Before the creation of this world of the senses, he teaches, God created the spiritual types of all things.¹³⁴ These types or ideas must however be conceived of as active causes, as powers which bring disordered matter into order.¹³⁵ It is by means of these spiritual powers

Mang. (Richter, small vol. 2).—*De somniis*, i. 630, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3).—Gfrörer, i. 123 sqq.—Dähne, i. 282 sqq.

¹³¹ *Legum alleg.* i. 44, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): Παύταις γὰρ οὐδέποτε ποιῶν ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' ἄσπερ ἴδιον τὸ καίειν πυρὸς, καὶ χιόνος τὸ ψύχειν, οὕτω καὶ θεοῦ τὸ ποιεῖν καὶ πολὺ γὰρ μᾶλλον, ὅσῳ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπασιν ἀρχὴ τοῦ δρᾶν ἀστίν.

¹³² Comp. Gfrörer, i. 143 sqq. Dähne, i. 161 sqq., 202 sqq. Zeller, iii. 2, pp. 360-370. Keferstein's above-named *Monograph*.

¹³³ *De victimas offerentibus*, ii. 261, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 4): Ἐξ ἐκείνης γὰρ [τῆς ὕλης] πάντ' ἐγίνετο ὁ θεός, οὐκ ἰφαιπτόμενος αὐτός· οὐ γὰρ ἦν θίμης ἀπειροῦ καὶ πεφυρμένης ὕλης ψαύειν τὸν ἴδιον καὶ μακάριον.

¹³⁴ *De mundi opificio*, i. 4, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): Προλαβὼν γὰρ ὁ θεός, ὅτι μίμημα καλὸν οὐκ ἂν ποτε γίνοιτο καλοῦ διχᾶ παραδείγματος, οὐδὲ τι τῶν αἰσθητῶν ἀνυπαίτιον, ὃ μὴ πρὸς ἀρχέτυπον καὶ νοητὴν ἰδέαν ἀπεικονίσθη, βουληθεὶς τὸν ὁρατὸν τουτοῦ κόσμου δημιουργῆσαι, προσετύπου τὸν νοητὸν, ἵνα χρώμενος ἀσμάτῃ καὶ θεωιδωτάτῃ παραδείγματι, τὸν σωματικὸν τοῦτον ἀπεργάσθαι, πρὸςβυτέρου νεώτερον ἀπεικονίσμα, τοσαῦτα περιέχοντα αἰσθητὰ γίνῃ, ὅσῳ περ ἐν ἐκείνῳ νοητά. Comp. the work *De mundi opificio*.

¹³⁵ *De victimas offerentibus*, ii. 261, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 4): ταῖς

that God acts in the world. They are His ministers and vicegerents, the ambassadors and mediums between God and things finite,¹³⁶ the λόγοι or partial powers of the universal reason.¹³⁷ By Moses they are called angels, by the Greeks daemons.¹³⁸ If according to this they appear to be conceived of as independent hypostases, nay as personal beings, other assertions again forbid us to take them for decidedly such. It is expressly said, that they exist only in the Divine thought.¹³⁹ They are designated as the infinite powers of the infinite God,¹⁴⁰ and thus regarded as an inseparable portion of the Divine existence. But it would again be a mistake, on the ground of these assertions to deny definitely the personification of the λόγοι or δυνάμεις. The truth is just this, that Philo conceived of them both as independent hypostases and as immanent determinations of the Divine existence. And it is an apt remark of Zeller's, that this contradiction is necessarily required by the premisses of Philo's system. "He combines both definitions without observing their contradiction, nay he

ἀσωμάτοις δυνάμεισιν, ὧν ἵτυμον ὄνομα αἱ ἰδίαι, κατεχρήσατο πρὸς τὸ γίνεσθαι ἑκάστην τὴν ἀρμόττουσαν λαβεῖν μορφὴν.—*De monarchia*, ii. 218 sq., Mang. (Richter, small vol. 4).

¹³⁶ *De Abrahamo*, ii. 17 sq., Mang. (Richter, small vol. 4): ἰσραὶ καὶ θείαι φύσεις, ὑποδιάκονοι καὶ ὑπαρχοὶ τοῦ πρώτου θεοῦ.—*De somniis*, i. 642, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 3).

¹³⁷ *Legum alleg.* i. 122, Mang. (Richter, small vol. 1): τοὺς ἀγγέλους καὶ λόγους αὐτοῦ.—*De somniis*, i. 631, Mang. (Richter, 3): τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ λόγους ἐπικουρίας ἵνα καὶ τῶν φιλαρέτων ἀποστέλλει.—*Ibid.* i. 640: ψυχαὶ δὲ εἰσιν ἀθάνατοι οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι.—On the identity of the λόγοι with the ideas see Heinze, *Lehre vom Logos*, p. 220.

¹³⁸ *De somniis*, i. 638, Mang. (Richter, 3): ἀθανάτοις λόγοις, οὓς καλεῖν ἴθος ἀγγέλους.—*Ibid.* i. 642: ταύτας (viz. pure souls) δαίμονας μὲν οἱ ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι, ὁ δὲ ἱερὸς λόγος ἀγγέλους εἰωθεὶ καλεῖν.—*De gigantibus*, i. 263, Mang. (Richter, 2): Οὓς ἄλλοι φιλόσοφοι δαίμονας, ἀγγέλους Μαῦσῃς εἰωθεὶ ὀνομάζουσιν ψυχὰς δὲ εἰσὶ κατὰ τὸν αἶρα πετόμεναι.

¹³⁹ *De mundi opificio*, i. 4, Mang. (Richter, 1): As the ideal city, whose plan the artist sketches, exists only in his mind, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον οὕδ' ὁ ἐκ τῶν ἰδεῶν κόσμος ἄλλων ἂν ἔχει τόπον ἢ τὸν θεῖον λόγον τὸν ταῦτα διακοσμήσαντα.—*Ibid.* i. 5, Mang.: Εἰ δὲ τις ἰδιότητις γυμνασθεὶς χρήσασθαι τοῖς δόγμασιν, οὐδὲν ἂν ἴτερον εἴποι τὸν νοητὸν εἶναι κόσμον, ἢ τοῦ λόγου ἥδη κοσμοποιούντος.

¹⁴⁰ *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, i. 173, Mang. (Richter, 1): ἀπερίγραφος γὰρ ὁ θεός, ἀπερίγραφοι καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ.

is unable to observe it, because otherwise the intermediary rôle assigned to the Divine powers would be forfeited, even that double nature, by reason of which they are on the one hand to be identical with God, that a participation in the Deity may by their means be possible to the finite, and on the other hand different from Him, that the Deity, notwithstanding this participation, may remain apart from all contact with the world."¹⁴¹

With this ambiguous view of the nature of the *δυνάμεις*, the question as to their origin must also necessarily remain undecided. It is true that Philo frequently expresses himself in an emanistic sense. But yet he never distinctly formulates the doctrine of emanation.¹⁴² The number of the *δυνάμεις* is in itself unlimited.¹⁴³ Yet Philo sometimes gives calculations, when comprising the individual powers under certain notions of species.¹⁴⁴ He mostly distinguishes two supreme powers: *goodness* and *might*,¹⁴⁵ which again are combined and reconciled by the Divine *Logos*, which, so far as it is reckoned among the powers at all, is the chief of all, the root from which the rest proceed, the most universal intermediary between God and the world, that in which are comprised all the operations of God.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴¹ *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2, p. 365.

¹⁴² Comp. Zeller, pp. 366-369.—*Emanistic*, e.g. *De profugis*, i. 575, Mang. (Richter, 3): God is ἡ πρωτοτάτη πηγὴ. Καὶ μή ποτ' εἰκότως. Τὸν γὰρ σύμπαντα τοῦτον κόσμον ὁμωβρησα.—Also *De somniis*, i. 688, Mang. (Richter, 3).

¹⁴³ *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, i. 173, Mang. (Richter, 1): ἀπειρίγραφοι αἱ δυνάμεις.—*De confusione linguarum*, i. 431, Mang. (Richter, 2): Εἴς ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἀμυθῆτους περὶ αὐτὸν ἔχει δυνάμεις.

¹⁴⁴ In *de profugis*, i. 560, Mang. (Richter, 3), he counts in all six, viz. besides the *θεῖος λόγος* the five following: ἡ ποιητικὴ, ἡ βασιλική, ἡ ἰατρικὴ, ἡ νομοθετικὴ, . . . (the last is wanting).

¹⁴⁵ Ἀγαθότης and ἀρχή (*De Cherubim*, i. 144, Mang., Richter, 1; *De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini*, i. 173, Mang., Richter, 1), εὐεργεσία and ἡγεμονία, or ἡ χαριστικὴ and ἡ βασιλική (both *de somniis*, i. 645, Mang., Richter, 3), ἡ εὐεργίτης and ἡ κολαστήριος (*de victimas offerentibus*, ii. 258, Mang., Richter, 4), also ἡ ποιητικὴ and ἡ βασιλική (because God created the world in consequence of His goodness, so *de Abrahamo*, ii. 19, Mang., Richter, 4. *Vita Mosis*, ii. 150, Mang., Richter, 4).

¹⁴⁶ *De profugis*, i. 560, Mang. (Richter, 3). *Quaest. in Exod.* ii. 68, p. 514 sq. (Richter, 7). Contrary to Zeller, who attempts to understand

3. *The Logos.*¹⁴⁷ "By the Logos Philo understands *the power of God or the active Divine intelligence in general*; he designates it as the idea which comprises all other ideas, the power which comprises all powers in itself, as the entirety of the supersensuous world or of the Divine powers."¹⁴⁸ It is neither uncreated nor created after the manner of finite things.¹⁴⁹ It is the vicegerent and ambassador of God;¹⁵⁰ the angel or archangel which delivers to us the revelations of God;¹⁵¹ the instrument by which God made the world.¹⁵² The Logos is thus identified with the creative word of God.¹⁵³ But not only is it the mediator for the relations of God to the world, but also for the relations of the world to God. The Logos is the High Priest, who makes intercession for the world to God.¹⁵⁴ But notwithstanding this apparently undoubted personification of the Logos, what has been said above of the Divine powers in general applies here also. "The definitions, which, according to the presuppositions of our thought, would

certain passages as saying, that the Logos is to be conceived of not as the root, but as the product or result of the two supreme powers (p. 370); see Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos*, p. 248 sqq.

¹⁴⁷ Comp. Gfrörer, i. 168–326. Dähne, i. 202 sqq. Zeller, iii. 2, pp. 370–386, and the above-named *Monographs*, especially those of Heinze and Soulier.

¹⁴⁸ Zeller, iii. 2, p. 371.

¹⁴⁹ *Quis rerum divinarum heres.* i. 501 sq., Mang. (Richter, 3): οὔτε ἀγέννητος ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἄν, οὔτε γυννητός ὡς ὑμεῖς, ἀλλὰ μέσος τῶν ἀκρων, ἀμφοτέροις ὁμωσέμενος.

¹⁵⁰ *Quis rer. div. her. l.c.*: πρεσβυτῆς τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπέκουν.

¹⁵¹ *Leg. allegor.* l. 122, Mang. (Richter, 1): τὸν ἀγγελον, ὃς ἐστὶ λόγος. — *De confusione linguarum*, i. 427, Mang. (Richter, 2): τὸν πρωτόγονον αὐτοῦ λόγον, τὸν ἀγγελον πρεσβύτατον, ὡς ἀρχάγγελον πολυάνουν ὑπάρχοντα. — *De somniis*, i. 656, Mang. (Richter, 3). — *Quis rer. div. her.* i. 501, fin. (Richter, 3). — *Quaest. in Exod.* ii. 13, p. 476 (Richter, 7).

¹⁵² *Leg. allegor.* i. 106, Mang. fin. (Richter, 1): Σκιά θεοῦ δι' ὃ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἐστίν, ἧ καθάπερ ὄργανον προσχρησάμενος ἐκσμοποιεῖ. — *De Cherubim*, i. 162, Mang. (Richter, 1): Εὐρήσεις γὰρ αἵτιον μὲν αὐτοῦ [τοῦ κόσμου] τὸν θεόν, ὅφ' οὗ γέγονεν ὕλην δι' τὰ τίσασα στοιχεῖα, ἐξ ἧν συνεκράθη ὄργανον δι' λόγον θεοῦ, δι' οὗ κατισκευάσθη τῆς δι' κατασκευῆς αἰτίας τὴν ἀγαθότητα τοῦ δημιουργοῦ.

¹⁵³ *Leg. alleg.* i. 47, Mang. (Richter, 1). *De sacrif. Abel. et Cain.* i. 165, Mang. (Richter, 1). Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos*, p. 230.

¹⁵⁴ *De gigantibus*, i. 269, Mang. fin. (Richter, 2): ὁ ἀρχιμενὺς λόγος ἰνδια-

require the personality of the Logos, are crossed in Philo by such as make it impossible, and the peculiarity of his mode of conception consists in his not perceiving the contradiction involved in making the idea of the Logos oscillate obscurely between personal and impersonal being. This peculiarity is equally misunderstood, when Philo's Logos is regarded absolutely as a person separate from God, and when on the contrary it is supposed that it only denotes God under a definite relation, according to the aspect of His activity. According to Philo's opinion the Logos is both, but for this very reason neither one nor the other exclusively; and he does not perceive, that it is impossible to combine these definitions into one notion."¹⁵⁵ "But Philo cannot dispense with these definitions. With him the Logos, like all the Divine powers, is only necessary, because the supreme God Himself can enter into no direct contact with the finite; it must stand between the two and be the medium of their mutual relation; and how can it be this unless it were different from both, if it were only a certain Divine property? In this case we should have again that direct action of God upon finite things, which Philo declares inadmissible. On the other hand the Logos must now indeed be again identical with each of the opposites which it was to reconcile, it must likewise be a property of God as a power operative in the world. Philo could not without contradiction succeed in combining the two."¹⁵⁶

Philo was, as it seems, the first to postulate, under the name of the Logos, such an intermediate being between God

τρίβειν αἰεὶ καὶ σχολάζειν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις δόμασι δυνάμενος.—*De migratione Abrahami*, i. 452, Mang. (Richter, 2): τὸν ἀρχιερέα λόγον.—*De profugis*, i. 562, Mang. (Richter, 3): λέγομεν γὰρ, τὸν ἀρχιερέα οὐκ ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῶν εἶναι, πάντων οὐχ ἰκονοῦν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκονοῦν ἀδικημάτων ἀμέτοχον.—*Quis rer. div. her.* i. 501, Mang. fin. (Richter, 3): 'Ο δ' αὐτός ἐκείτης μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος αἰεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἀφθαρτον.—*Vita Moysis*, ii. 155, Mang. (Richter, 4): Ἀναγκάσιον γὰρ ἦν τὸν ἱερωμένον τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρὶ παρακλήτῃ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῃ τῇν ἀρετὴν υἱῷ, πρὸς τε ἀμνηστίαν ἀμαρτημάτων καὶ χορηγίαν ἀφθονωτάτων ἀγαθῶν.

¹⁵⁵ Zeller, iii. 2, p. 378.

¹⁵⁶ Zeller, iii. 2, p. 380 sq.

and the world.¹⁵⁷ Points of contact for his doctrine lay in both Jewish theology and Greek philosophy. In the former it was chiefly the doctrine of the *wisdom* of God, and in the second place, that of the *Spirit* and the *Word* of God, which Philo took up. From the Platonic philosophy it was the doctrine of ideas and of the soul of the world, which he utilized for his purpose. But it is the Stoic doctrine of the Deity as the active reason of the world, which is the nearest to his. "We need only to strip off from this Stoic doctrine of the Logos, its pantheistic element, by distinguishing the Logos from the Deity, and its materialistic element by distinguishing it from organized matter, to have the Philonean Logos complete."¹⁵⁸

4. *The creation and preservation of the world.*¹⁵⁹ All existence cannot however, the intermediate beings notwithstanding, be traced back to God. For the evil, the imperfect can in no wise, not even indirectly, have its cause in God.¹⁶⁰ It originates from a second principle, from matter (ὕλη, or stoically οὐσία). This is the formless, lifeless, unmoved, unordered mass devoid of properties, from which God, by means of the Logos and the divine powers, formed the world.¹⁶¹ For only

¹⁵⁷ In the Wisdom of Solomon the Divine word is certainly once personified as elsewhere wisdom is. But this is merely a poetical personification, not an actual hypostatification. The author applies the term *Wisdom* of God to represent the notion of an intermediary hypostasis, so far as he entertains it. Comp. also Grimm on the passage. In the Targums the "word of God" (Memra) certainly plays a rôle similar to that of the Logos in Philo. But these were very probably already under his influence.

¹⁵⁸ Zeller, iii. 2, p. 385.

¹⁵⁹ Comp. Gfrörer, i. 327 sqq. Dähne, i. 170 sqq., 246 sqq. Zeller, iii. 2, pp. 386-393.

¹⁶⁰ Comp. Zeller, iii. 3, p. 386, note 1.

¹⁶¹ *De mundi opificio*, i. 5, Mang. (Richter, 1): Matter is ἐξ ἰαντῆς ἀτακτος, ἄπειρος, ἀψυχος, ἑτεροποιότητος, ἀναρμοστίας, ἀσυμφωνίας μωτή.—*Quis rerum divinarum heres*. i. 492, Mang. *fin.* (Richter, 3): τῇν τι ἀμορφον καὶ ἄπειρον τῶν ὅλων οὐσίαν.—*De profugis*, i. 547, Mang. (Richter, 3): τῇν ἄπειρον καὶ ἀνείδιον καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον οὐσίαν.—*Ibid.*: ἡ ἄπειρος ὕλη.—*De victimas offerentibus*, ii. 261, Mang. (Richter, 4): ἀμορφος ὕλη.—*Ibid.*: ἀπίρου καὶ πιθυρμένης ἕλης.—*De creatione principum*, ii. 367, Mang.

a forming of the world and not creation in its proper sense is spoken of in Philo, since the origin of matter is not in God, but it is placed as a second principle beside Him. And the preservation of the world as well as its formation is effected by means of the Logos and the Divine powers. Nay the former is in truth but a continuation of the latter; and what we call the laws of nature are but the totality of the regular Divine operations.¹⁶³

5. *Anthropology*.¹⁶⁴ It is in anthropology, where Philo chiefly follows the Platonic doctrine, that the dualistic basis of his system comes most strongly to light. Philo here starts from the assumption, that the entire atmosphere is filled with souls. Of these it is the angels or demons dwelling in its higher parts who are the mediums of God's intercourse with the world.¹⁶⁴ Those on the contrary who remain nearer to the earth, are attracted by sense and descend into mortal bodies.¹⁶⁵ Consequently the soul of man is nothing else than one of those Divine powers, of those emanations of Deity, which in their original state are called angels or daemons. It is only the life-sustaining, sensitive soul that originates by generation, and indeed from the aeriform elements of the seed; reason on the contrary enters into man from without.¹⁶⁶ The

(Richter, 5): Μηνύει δ' ἡ τοῦ κόσμου γένεσις τε καὶ διοίκησις. Τὰ γὰρ μὴ ὄντα ἐκάλισεν εἰς τὸ εἶναι, τάξιν ἐξ ἀταξίας, καὶ ἐξ ἀποιῶν ποιότητας, καὶ ἐξ ἀνομοίων ὁμοιότητας, καὶ ἐξ ἰτεροτήτων ταυτότητας, καὶ ἐξ ἀκοινωνήτων καὶ ἀναρρόδων κοινωνίας καὶ ἁρμονίας, καὶ ἐκ μὲν ἀνισότητος ἰσότητα, ἐκ δὲ ἀκούτου Φῶς ἔργασάμενος. Ἄσι γὰρ ἔστιν ἐπιμελὲς αὐτῷ καὶ ταῖς ἐνεργήταις αὐτοῦ δυνάμει τὸ πλημμελὲς τῆς χείρονος οὐσίας μεταποιεῖν καὶ μεθαρμόζεσθαι πρὸς τὴν ἀμείνου.

¹⁶³ Comp. Zeller, iii. 2, p. 389 sq.

¹⁶⁴ Comp. Gfrörer, i. 373-415. Dähne, i. 288-340. Zeller, iii. 2, pp. 393-402.

¹⁶⁴ *De somniis*, i. 642, Mang. (Richter, 8).

¹⁶⁵ *De gigantibus*, i. 263 sq., Mang. (Richter, 2).

¹⁶⁶ *De mundi opificio*, i. 15, Mang. (Richter, 1): 'Ἡ δὲ [ἡ κίνησις] οἷα τεχνίτης, ἡ κυριώτερον ἐκτελεῖν, ἀνεπίληπτος τέχνη, ζωοπλαστοῦ τὴν μὲν ὑγρὰν οὐσίαν εἰς τὰ τοῦ σώματος μέρη καὶ μέρη διανέμουσα, τὴν δὲ πνευματικὴν εἰς τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς δυνάμεις, τὴν τε θρηπτικὴν καὶ τὴν αἰσθητικὴν. Τὴν γὰρ τοῦ λογισμοῦ ταυρὺν ὑπερθετίον, διὰ τοῦς φάσκοντας θύραθεν αὐτὸν ἐπεισιέναι, θεῖον καὶ αἰθερίον ὄντα.

human πνεῦμα is thus an emanation of Deity: God breathed *His* spirit into man.¹⁶⁷—The body as the animal part of man is the source of all evil, it is the prison to which the spirit is banished,¹⁶⁸ the corpse which the soul drags about with it,¹⁶⁹ the coffin or the grave, from which it will first awake to true life.¹⁷⁰ Sense as such being evil, sin is innate in man.¹⁷¹ No one can keep himself free from it, even if he were to live but a day.¹⁷²

6. *Ethic.*¹⁷³ According to these anthropologic assumptions it is self-evident, that the chief principle of ethic is the *utmost possible renunciation of sensuousness*, the extirpation of desire and of the passions. Hence among philosophical systems, the Stoic must be most of all congenial to Philo in the matter of ethic. It is this that he chiefly embraces, not only in its fundamental thought of the mortification of the senses, but also in single statements, as in the doctrine of the four cardinal virtues¹⁷⁴ and of the four passions.¹⁷⁵ Like the Stoics he teaches, that there

¹⁶⁷ *Quod deterius potiori insidiatur*, i. 206 sq., Mang. (Richter, 1).—*De mundi opificio*, i. 32, Mang. (Richter, 1).—*De specialibus legibus*, ii. 356, Mang. (Richter, 5).—*Quis rerum divinarum heres*, i. 480 sq., 498 sq., Mang. (Richter, 3).

¹⁶⁸ Δυσμυτήριον, *De ebrietate*, i. 372, *fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 2). *Leg. allegor.* i. 95, *sub fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 1). *De migratione Abrahami*, i. 487, *sub fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 2).

¹⁶⁹ Νεκρὸν σῶμα, *Leg. allegor.* i. 100 sq., Mang. (Richter, 1). *De gigantibus*, i. 264, *med.* Mang. (Richter, 2). Τὸν ψυχῆς ἔγγιστα εἶπεν, ὃν ἀπὸ γυναικὸς ἀχρί τελευτῆς, ἀχθος τοσούτου, ὥς ἀποτίθεται νεκροφορεῖσθαι, *De Agricultura Noe*, i. 306, Mang. (Richter, 2).

¹⁷⁰ Λάρναξ ἢ σορός, *De migratione Abrahami*, i. 498, *sub fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 2).—σῆμα, *Leg. allegor.* i. 65, *sub fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 1).

¹⁷¹ *Vita Mosii*, ii. 157, Mang. (Richter, 4): παντὶ γυναικὶ καὶ ἀν σπουδαίον ᾗ, παρ' ὅσων ἤλθην εἰς γίνεσθαι, συμφυεῖς τὸ ἀμαρτάνου ἐστίν.

¹⁷² *De mutatione nominum*, i. 586, Mang. (Richter, 3): Τίς γὰρ, ὡς δ' Ἰώβ φησι, καθαρὸς ἀπὸ βύπτου, καὶ ἀν μίᾳ ἡμέρᾳ ἐστὶν ἡ ζωὴ (Job xiv. 4 sq.).

¹⁷³ Comp. Gfrörer, i. 415 sqq. Dähne, i. 341–423. Zeller, iii. 2, pp. 402–416. Frankel in the above-cited article. Kähler, *Das Gewissen*, i. 1 (1878), p. 171 sqq.

¹⁷⁴ Φρόνησις, σωφροσύνη, ἀνδρεία, δικαιοσύνη, *Leg. allegor.* i. 56, Mang. (Richter, 1), and frequently.

¹⁷⁵ *Leg. allegor.* i. 114, *sub fin.*, Mang. (Richter, 1).

is only one good, morality;¹⁷⁶ like them he requires freedom from all passions,¹⁷⁷ and the greatest possible simplicity of life;¹⁷⁸ like them he also is a cosmopolitan.¹⁷⁹ But with all this affinity Philo's ethic still essentially differs from the Stoic. The Stoics refer man to his own strength; according to Philo, man, as a sensuous being, is incapable of liberating himself from sensuousness: for this he needs the help of God. It is God who plants and promotes the virtues in the soul of man. Only he, who honours Him and yields himself to His influence, can attain to perfection.¹⁸⁰ True morality is, as Plato teaches, the imitation of the Deity.¹⁸¹ In this religious basis of ethic Philo is very decidedly distinguished from the Stoics. Political activity, and practical morality in general, have a value only so far as they are a necessary medium for contending against evil.¹⁸² But knowledge also must subserve this one object, and hence ethic is the most important part of philosophy.¹⁸³ Nevertheless the purity of

¹⁷⁶ Μόνον εἶναι τὸ καλὸν ἀγαθόν, *De posteritate Caini*, i. 251, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 2).

¹⁷⁷ *Leg. allegor.* i. 100, Mang. (Richter, 1): 'Ὁ δὲ ἔφρις, ἡ ἡδονή, ἐξ ἑαυτῆς ἐστὶ μοχθηρά. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν μὲν σπουδαίῳ οὐχ ὑρίσκεται τὸ παράπαν, μόνος δὲ αὐτῆς ὁ Φαῦλος ἀπολαύει.—*Ibid.* i. 113, *init.*: Μωϋσῆς δὲ ὅλον τὸν θυμὸν ἐκτέμνειν καὶ ἀποκόπτειν οἷσται διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς, οὐ μετριοπάθειαν, ἀλλὰ συνόλως ἀπάθειαν ἀγαπῶν.

¹⁷⁸ *De somniis*, i. 639–665, Mang. (Richter, 3).—*Leg. allegor.* i. 115, Mang. (Richter, 1).—*Quod deterius potiori insidiatur*, i. 198, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 1).

¹⁷⁹ See Zeller, iii. 2, p. 404.

¹⁸⁰ *Leg. allegor.* i. 53, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 1): πρέπει τῇ θεῷ Φυτεῖναι καὶ οἰκοδομεῖν ἐν ψυχῇ τὰς ἀρετάς.—*Ibid.* i. 60: "Ὅταν ἐκβῇ ὁ νοῦς ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀνενίκηκον θεῷ, ἀσπὶρ ὁ γίγας Ἰσαάκ, τηρικαῦτα ὁμολογίαν τὴν πρὸς τὸν ὄντα ποιῆται. "Ἐὰς δὲ αὐτὸν ὑποτίθεται ὡς αἰτιὸν τινος, μακρὰν ἀξίωσιν τοῦ παραχωρεῖν θεῷ καὶ ὁμολογεῖν αὐτῷ. Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ ἐξομολογεῖσθαι νοήτιον, ὅτι ἔργον ἐστὶν οὐχὶ τῆς ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ τοῦ φαίνοντος αὐτῇ θεοῦ τὸ εὐχάριστον.—*Ibid.* i. 131: αὐτὸς γὰρ [ὁ κύριος] πατήρ ἐστὶ τῆς τελείας φύσεως, σπείρων ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς καὶ γινεῶν τὸ εὐδαιμονεῖν.

¹⁸¹ *De mundi orificio*, i. 35, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 1).—*De decalogo*, ii. 193, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 4).—*De caritate*, ii. 404, *init.*, Mang. (Richter, 5).—*De migratione Abrahami*, i. 456, *med.* 463, Mang. (Richter, 2).

¹⁸² See Zeller, iii. 2, p. 406 sq.

¹⁸³ *De mutatione nominum*, i. 589, Mang. (Richter, 3): Καθάπερ δένδρῳ

life attained by such self-knowledge is not the ultimate and supreme object of human development. On the contrary the origin of man being transcendental, the object of his development is likewise transcendental. As it was by falling away from God that he was entangled in this life of sense, so must he struggle up from it to the direct *vision of God*. This object is attainable even in this earthly life. For the truly wise and virtuous man is lifted above and out of himself, and in such ecstasy beholds and recognises Deity itself. His own consciousness sinks and disappears in the Divine light; and the Spirit of God dwells in him and stirs him like the strings of a musical instrument.¹⁸⁴ He, who has in this way attained to the vision of the Divine, has reached the highest degree of earthly happiness. Beyond it lies only complete deliverance from this body, that return of the soul to its original incorporeal condition, which is bestowed on those who have kept themselves free from attachment to this sensuous body.¹⁸⁵

ὡδὲν ὀφείλος, εἰ μὴ καρπῶν οἰστικά γίνετο, τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον ὡδὲν φυσιο-
λογίας, εἰ μὴ μέλλοι κτῆσιν ἀρετῆς ἐνεργεῖν κ.τ.λ.—*De agricultura Noe*, i.
302, Mang. (Richter, 2). In both passages Philo compares physics to the
plants and trees; logic to the hedges and fences; ethic to the fruits. He
praises the Essenes for exclusively occupying themselves with ethic (*Quod
omnis probus liber*, ii. 458, Mang.).

¹⁸⁴ Philo thus addresses the soul in *Quis rerum divinarum heres*. i. 482,
Mang. (Richter, 3): *σαυτὴν ἀποδραβὶ καὶ ἱσταθὶ σιαντῆς, καθάπερ οἱ κορυβαν-
τιῶντες καὶ κατεχόμενοι, βακχευθῆσα καὶ θεοφορηθῆσα κατὰ τινα προφητικὸς
ἐπιθειασμὸν. Ἐνθουσίῃς γὰρ καὶ οὐκ ἔτι οὐσῃς ἐν ἑαυτῇ διανοίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἔρωτ
οὐρανίῃ σισοβημένης καὶ ἐκμενηνίας κ.τ.λ. *Quis rerum divinarum heres*. i.
508 sqq., Mang. (Richter, 3), especially i. 511 (where Philo dilates at
length upon the ecstatic state).*

¹⁸⁵ *De Abrahamo*, ii. 37, Mang. (Richter, 4): Wisdom teaches, τὸν
θάνατον νομίζον μὴ σβῆσαι ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ χωρισμὸν καὶ διάζευξιν ἀπὸ σώματος,
ὅθεν ἦλθεν ἀπολύσεως. Ἦλθε δὲ, ὡς ἐν τῇ κοσμοποιίᾳ διδῆλνται, παρὰ θεοῦ.—
Leg. allegor. i. 65 (Richter, 1): Εὖ καὶ ὁ Ἡράκλειτος κατὰ τοῦτο Μωϋσίου
ἀκολουθήσας τῇ δόγματι· Φησὶ γὰρ “Ζῶμεν τὸν ἑαυτῶν θάνατον, τιθήκαμεν
δὲ τὸν ἑαυτῶν βίον,” ὡς νῦν μὲν, ὅτι ἐνζῶμεν, τιθηνηνίας τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ ὡς ἂν
ἐν σῆματι τῷ σώματι ἐντιτυμβενμένης· εἰ δὲ ἀποθάνοιμεν, τῆς ψυχῆς ζῶσης. For
those who have not freed themselves from sense, Philo has to accept, after
the occurrence of natural death, a transition to another body, that is a
transmigration of souls. See Zeller, iii. 2. 397

Philo's influence upon the two circles, which he had chiefly in view, viz. Judaism and heathenism, was impaired by the fact, that from his time onward Jewish Hellenism in general gradually lost in importance. On the one hand, the Pharisaic tendency gained strength in the Dispersion also, on the other Hellenistic Judaism was, in respect of its influence upon heathen circles, repressed, nay altogether dissolved by Christianity, which was now in its prime. Hence Judæo-Hellenistic philosophy had gradually to give place to its stronger rival in both regions. Its influence was nevertheless still considerable. Jewish Rabbis and heathen neo-Platonists were more or less affected by it. Its strongest and most enduring influence was however exercised, in a direction which still lay outside Philo's horizon, upon the development of Christian dogma. The New Testament already shows unmistakeable traces of Philonean wisdom; and almost all the Greek Fathers of the first century, the apologists as well as the Alexandrians, the Gnostics as well as their adversaries, and even the great Greek theologians of subsequent centuries have, some more some less, either directly or indirectly, consciously or unconsciously drawn from Philo. But to follow out these traces lies beyond the province of this work.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁶ Compare on the history of Philo's influence, Siegfried, *Philo*, pp. 273-399.


INDEX TO DIVISION II.

- ABRAHAM**, book of, iii. 148.
Accusations against the Jews, iii. 263 ; concerning their origin, 264 ; want of culture, 264 ; atheism, 265 ; sacrifice of a Greek, 266 ; worship of the emperor, 267 ; social isolation, 267 ; circumcision, 269 ; abstinence from swine's flesh, 269 ; observance of the Sabbath, 269.
Adam, books of, iii. 147.
Amarkelin, i. 263.
Apion, iii. 257.
Apollonius Molon, iii. 251.
Apologetic, iii. 248, 262.
Aquila and Theodotion, iii. 168.
Aristeas, iii. 208, 306.
Aristobulus, iii. 237.
Artapanus, iii. 206.
Assumptio Moësis, the, iii. 73.
Augustus, worship of, at Caesarea, i. 15 sq.
BARUCH, the Apocalypse of, iii. 83.
Baruch, book of, iii. 188 ; date of its composition, 191.
CANON, the, i. 310.
Chaberim, name explained, ii. 22.
Chaeremon, iii. 255.
Cleanness and uncleanness, ordinances concerning, ii. 106.
Cleanness or uncleanness of earthen vessels, ii. 107 ; of wooden, leathern, bone and glass vessels, 108.
Cleodemus (or Malchus), iii. 209.
Coins and worship of Dora, i. 17 ; Ptolemais, 17 ; Damascus, 18 ; Kanatha and Philadelphia, 19 ; Scythopolis, 19 ; Decapolis, 20 ; Samaria, 20 ; Sepphoris, 21 ; Tiberias, 21.
Constitution of Jewish communities in the Dispersion, ii. 243 ; their internal organization, 243 ; their political position, 252.
Culture, Hellenic, diffusion of, i. 11.
Culture, state of, in general, i. 1.
DAGON, worship of, i. 14.
Daniel, additions to, iii. 183.
Daniel, book of, iii. 49.
Demetrius, iii. 200.
Derceto or Atargatis, worship of, i. 13 sq.
Development of the Messianic hope, historical survey of the, ii. 137 ; apocryphal books of the Old Testament, 138 ; the Jewish Sibyllines, 139 ; book of Enoch, 141 ; Psalterium Salomonis, 142 ; Assumptio Moësis, 144 ; book of Jubilees, 145 ; New Testament, 148 ; popular tumults, 149 ; Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra, 150.
Diogenea, letter of, iii. 317.
Dislike of the Graeco-Roman world to the Jews, ii. 296.
Dispersion, the, extent of, ii. 220.
Districts east of Lake of Gennesareth, i. 4.
Dusares, worship of, i. 22.
ELDAD and Modad, iii. 129.
Elijah, apocalypse of, iii. 129.
Enoch, book of, iii. 54 ; the original writing, 61 ; the allegories, 66 ; the Noachian portions, 69.
Epic poetry and the drama, iii. 222.
Epic poet, the, Philo, iii. 222.
Erubh, appointments concerning the, ii. 120.
Essenes, the, ii. 188 ; their daily labour, 197 ; ethics, manners and customs of, 198 ; theology of, 202.
Essenism, nature and origin of, ii. 205 ; influence of Buddhism, 215 ; Parseism, 216 ; Pythagoreanism upon, 216.
FASTING, rules concerning, ii. 118.
GAMES, Greek, in cities of Palestine, i. 23-28, 32-34.
Genesis, the smaller, iii. 135.
Gentiles, participation of, in the worship at Jerusalem, i. 299.
Gentiles, varying degrees of observance of the ceremonial law by, ii. 311.
God-fearing Gentiles, ii. 314.

- Grace before and after meals, ii. 117.
 Greek architecture, i. 34; music, 36; plastic art, 36; writing, 36; trade and industry, 37, and coinage in Palestine, 38.
 Greek and Latin words in the Mishna, i. 46, 47.
 Greek and Roman coins, i. 28-40; articles of commerce, 41-45; domestic utensils, 45, in Palestine.
 Greek poets, forged verses of, iii. 294.
- HAGGADAH, the, i. 339.
 Haggadic treatment of the history of the Creation, etc., i. 342.
 Halachah and Haggadah, i. 329.
 Halachic Midraah, i. 331.
 Heathen idolatry and non-observance of the Levitical law guarded against, i. 52, 54.
 Hecataeus, iii. 302.
 Hellenism in the Jewish region, i. 29.
 Hellenism in non-Jewish regions, i. 11.
 Hellenistic towns, constitutions of, i. 57-60.
 Hermippus, iii. 317.
 High priest, functions of the, i. 254.
 High priests, i. 195; list of, 197; persons described as *ἱερεῖς* but not found in, 203.
 Historical works of Philo, iii. 219.
 Historiography, iii. 6; Maccabees, first book of, 7.
 Holy Scripture, canonical dignity of, i. 306.
 Houses, letting of, to Gentiles forbidden, i. 55.
 Hyrcanus, Chronicles of, iii. 3.
 Hystaspes, iii. 292.
- ISAIAH, martyrdom of, iii. 141.
- JEREMIAH, the letter of, iii. 195.
 Jerusalem, the only city proper, i. 161.
 Jesus the son of Sirach, iii. 23; Greek translation of, 27; Hebrew text of, 27.
 Jewish communities recognised by the State, ii. 260; administer their own funds, 260; exercise jurisdiction over their members, 262.
 Jewish law, the, a law of ritual, i. 337.
 Jewish region, threefold division of, i. 2.
 Jewish propagandism, success of, ii. 297; testimony of Josephus to, 305; of Seneca and Dio Cassius to, 307; of the Acts, 308; of Horace and Juvenal, 308.
 Jewish temple at Leontopolis, ii. 28.
 Jewish territory, the strictly, i. 149.
 Jews admitted to rights of Roman citizenship, ii. 276.
- Jews, the, admitted in some towns to rights of citizenship, ii. 271.
 Jews, exemption of, from military service, ii. 264.
 Jews of the Dispersion, religious life of, ii. 281.
 Jews, position of, in mainly heathen communities, i. 148.
 John Hyrcanus, history of, iii. 13.
 Josephus, works of, iii. 221.
 Jubilees, the book of, iii. 134.
 Judaea, division of, into toparchies, i. 157.
 Judaism, extension of, i. 1.
 Judaism, foreign influences on, i. 350.
 Judaism in the Dispersion, ii. 219.
 Judaism, position of, with respect to heathenism, i. 51.
 Judaism treated as a *religio licita*, ii. 259.
 Judith, book of, iii. 32.
 Justus of Tiberias, iii. 222.
- LANGUAGE, Greek, knowledge of, i. 48-50.
 Language, Latin, use of, i. 50, 51.
 Language, the, of Jewish population, i. 8.
 Law of Moses, canonical, i. 306.
 Legendary works, Lost, iii. 146.
 Legends, the sacred, iii. 132.
 Levites, the, i. 223; their courses, 225; residence, 229.
 Life under the law, ii. 90.
 Literati, Greek, in Palestine, i. 28, 29.
 Literature, historical, Graeco-Jewish, iii. 195.
 Literature, the Graeco-Jewish, iii. 156.
 Literature, the Palestinian Jewish, iii. 1.
 Local courts, i. 151 sqq.
 Lysimachus, iii. 254.
- MACCABEES, first book of, iii. 7.
 Maccabees, second book of, iii. 210; date of, 213.
 Maccabees, third book of, iii. 216; date of, 218.
 Maccabees, fourth book of, iii. 244.
 Magic and magical spells, books of, iii. 151.
 Manasseh, Prayer of, iii. 183.
 Mementoes, the three, ii. 111.
 Messiah, the suffering, ii. 184.
 Messianic hope, the, ii. 126; the distinction of the later from the older, 129.
 Messianic theology, systematic statement of, ii. 154; the last tribulation, 154; Elijah as forerunner, 156; the appearing of the Messiah, 158; last attack of hostile powers, 164; de-

- struction of hostile powers, 165 ;
renovation of Jerusalem, 168 ;
gathering of the dispersed, 169 ;
kingdom of glory in Palestine, 170 ;
renovation of the world, 177 ; the
general resurrection, 179.
Moses and his time, iii. 149.
Moses, apocryphal literature regarding,
iii. 149.
Musicians, sacred, the, i. 270.
- NARRATIVE, hortatory, iii. 32.
Native and Greek religions, mixture
of, i. 13.
Nicephorus, stichometry of, iii. 125.
- OPPONENTS, the literary, iii. 249.
- PALESTINE, Jewish population of, i. 1.
Palestinian Jewish literature, iii. 1 ;
native historical works, 3 ; pseudopi-
graphic writings, 44.
Pharisaic party proceeded from the
scribes, ii. 9.
Pharisaism, history and origin of, ii. 25.
Pharisaism, religious and dogmatic
views of, ii. 12 ; politics of, 17.
Pharisees and Sadducees, ii. 1 ; testi-
mony of Josephus concerning, 2 ; of
the Mishna, 5.
Pharisees, name of, explained, ii. 19.
Pharisees, the, ii. 10.
Philo, iii. 243.
Philo the Jewish philosopher, life and
writings of, iii. 321 ; *Quæstiones et
solutiones*, 327 ; *Legum allegoriarum*,
lib. i. ii. and iii., 331 ; *De Cherubim
et flammeo gladio*, 332 ; *De sacrificiis
Abelis et Caini*, 332 ; *Quod deterius
potiori insidiari solet*, 333 ; *De
posteritate Caini sibi visæ sapientis
et quo pacto sedem mutat*, 333 ; *De
gigantibus*, 334 ; *De agricultura*,
335 ; *De ebrietate*, 335 ; *De
sobrietate*, 335 ; *De confusione
linguarum*, 335 ; *De migratione
Abrahami*, 335 ; *Quis rerum divin-
arum hæres sit*, 336 ; *De congressu
quaerendæ eruditionis causa*, 336 ;
De profugis, 337 ; *De mutatione
nominum*, 337 ; *De somniis*, 337 ;
*Delineation of the Mosaic legisla-
tion for non-Jews*, 338 ; *De mundi
opificio*, 339 ; *De Abrahamo*, 341 ;
De Josepho, 341 ; *De decalogo*, 342 ;
De specialibus legibus, 343 ; *De
fortitudine*, 345 ; *De præmiis et
poenis*, 347 ; *Vita Mosi*, 348 ;
Quod omnia probus liber, 349 ;
Adversus Flaccum, 349 ; *De pro-
videntia*, 354 ; *De Alexandro et
quod propriam rationem muta ani-*
malia habeant, 355 ; *Traditio*, 355 ;
Περὶ Ἰουδαίων, 356 ; the lost books,
356 ; spurious works, 357.
Philo, the doctrine of, iii. 362 ; a
Greek philosopher, 364 ; remained a
Jew, 365 ; his allegorical interpreta-
tion, 367 ; his double mission, 367 ;
his doctrine of God, 369 ; inter-
mediate beings, 371 ; the Logos,
374 ; creation and preservation of
the world, 376 ; anthropology, 377 ;
ethic, 378 ; influence, 381.
Philosophy, iii. 228.
Philosophy, Greek, influence of, iii.
233.
Pirke Aboth, the, iii. 30.
Poet, the tragic, Ezekiel, iii. 225.
Police, duties of, to the temple, ful-
filled by priests and Levites, i. 264.
Prayers, legal appointments concern-
ing, ii. 115.
Presidents, functions of the, i. 259.
Priesthood, the, a distinct order, i.
207 ; a sacred order, 213.
Priesthood, the, and temple worship,
i. 207.
Priests, emoluments of, i. 230 ; first-
lings and tithes, 231 ; portions of
offerings, 232 ; dues independent of
sacrifices, 237 ; extraordinary offer-
ings, 245.
Priests, pedigree, the primary requisite
in, i. 210 ; regulations concerning
marriage of, 210 ; must be free from
physical defect, 214 ; consecration of,
214 ; twenty-four families or courses
of, 216.
Propaganda, Jewish, under a heathen
mask, iii. 270.
Prophecies, pseudepigraphic, iii. 44 ;
contents, 45 ; form, 46.
Prophecies, pseudepigraphic, the lost,
iii. 124.
Prophets and historical books also
canonical, i. 308.
Proselytes, ii. 291, 316 ; baptism of,
321 ; obligations of, 324.
Proseuchæ, ii. 73.
Public worship, imposts for defraying
expense of, i. 249 ; free-will offerings
for, 258.
Purification, different kinds of, ii. 109.
- RABBI, title of, i. 315.
Rabbinical power, increase of, after the
fall of Jerusalem, i. 365.
Rabbis, legislative power of, i. 323.
Religions, native, i. 11.
Retribution, divine, faith in, ii. 91.
- SABBATH sanctification, ii. 96.
Sabbath, thirty-nine prohibited works

- on the, ii. 97; other employments forbidden, 102.
- Sacrifices, public and private, i. 279.
- Sadducean party proceeded from the priests, ii. 9.
- Sadducees, the, ii. 29; distinctive marks of, 29, 34, 36, 39.
- Samaritans, the, i. 5; position of Judaism proper with respect to, 7.
- Sanhedrim, the supreme, in Jerusalem, its history, i. 165; its composition, 174; president, 180; jurisdiction, 184; time and place of meeting, 190; its judicial procedure, 193.
- School and synagogue, ii. 44.
- School, the, ii. 46; subject of instruction, 50.
- Schools of Hillel and Shammai, i. 361.
- Scribes, labours of, gratuitous, i. 317.
- Scribes, professional employment of, i. 320.
- Scribes, the, and their activity in general, i. 312; real teachers of the people, 313.
- Scribe, the most famous, i. 351; the five pairs of, 356.
- Scribism, i. 306.
- Scripture lessons, ii. 79; sermon, 82.
- Scripture literature, revision and completion of, iii. 175.
- Segan, functions of the, i. 257.
- Septuagint, the, iii. 159; accepted by the Jews of the dispersion, 163.
- Service, morning, the, i. 292; evening, 297.
- Service, the daily, i. 273.
- Shema, the, ii. 83.
- Shemoneh Esreh, the, ii. 85.
- Sibyllines, the, iii. 271; survey of the contents of, 277; date of composition, 280.
- Small pieces of Jewish origin under heathen names, iii. 316.
- Solomon as an author of magic, iii. 152.
- Solomon, Psalms of, iii. 17.
- Solomon, wisdom of, iii. 230.
- Symmachus, iii. 169.
- Synagogue, the, ii. 52; presupposes a religious community, 55; officials of, 56; religious discipline, 60; rules of, 63; Decem otiosi, 67; the building, 68.
- Synagogue, order of Divine worship in, ii. 75.
- TEMPLE, topographical observations on, i. 280.
- Temple tribute and festival pilgrimages of the Jews of the Dispersion, ii. 288.
- Temple, vocal and instrumental music in the, i. 290.
- Theodotus, iii. 224.
- Tohit, book of, iii. 37.
- Towns in and near Palestine, general history of, i. 61-63; their kind of dependence on Rome different, 63-66; special history of, 66-148; Raphia, 66; Gaza, 68 sqq.; Anthedon, 72; Ascalon, 74; Azotus, 76; Jamnai, 78; Joppa, 79; Apollonia, 83; Straton's Tower, 84; Dora, 87; Ptolemais, 90; Damascus, 96; Hippus, 98; Gadara, 100; Abila, 104; Raphana, 106; Kanata, 106; Kanatha, 108; Scythopolis, 110; Pella, 113; Dium, 115; Gerasa, 116; Philadelphia, 119; Sebaste-Samaria, 123; Gaba, 127; Esbon or Hesbon, 128; Antipatris, 130; Phasaelis, 131; Caesarea Parias, 132; Julias, formerly Bethsaida, 135; Sepphoris, 136; Julias or Livias, 141; Tiberias, 143.
- Translations of Scripture, iii. 159.
- Treasurers, functions of the, i. 261.
- Twelve Patriarchs, Testaments of the, iii. 114.
- VILLAGES subordinate to towns, i. 154 sqq.
- WISDOM, the gnomic, iii. 23.
- Works, the lost legendary, iii. 146.
- Writer, an anonymous, iii. 210.
- ZEPHANIAH, Apocalypse of, iii. 132.



MORRISON AND GIBB, EDINBURGH,
PRINTERS TO HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

ERRATA.

VOL. I.

- P. 2, l. 16, after *population* read *Lastly the Samaritans also must in a wider sense be reckoned as belonging to the Jewish population*
P. 3, l. 9, for *scribes and Pharisees* read *Pharisaic scribes*; and after l. 9, *chief seat* read *down to the destruction of the Holy City*
P. 4, l. 5, for *a century* read *centuries*
P. 4, note, for *fundamental* read *legal*?
P. 5, l. 2, for *grandson* read *grandsons*
P. 5, l. 5, after *caves* insert (ἱερῶν)
P. 5, note 14, l. 5 from foot, for *Articles in the Kunde des Morgenlandes* read *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*
P. 5, note 14, l. 8 from foot, for *Rcess* read *Reuss*
P. 8, note 25, for *Sadducees* read *Sadducean women*, and for *Samaritans* read *Samaritan women*
P. 9, note 26, l. 1, for *Zung* read *Zunz*
P. 10, l. 7, for *It was read aloud, etc.* read *The Holy Scriptures were read aloud in it before as afterwards*
P. 12, last line, for *other than Grecian deities* read *other Grecian deities*
P. 42, last line, for *Kürbis* read *pumpkins*
P. 44, line 2, for *paragandion* read *paragaudion*
P. 47, l. 6, for *Alexander* read *Menelaus*
P. 50, l. 10, for *R. Tomael* read *R. Ismael*
P. 64, last line, for *when* read *When*
P. 65, l. 17, for *a position of exemption from taxes* read *an exempt position*
P. 68, l. 1, for *hence* read *never*
P. 74, l. 7, after *Majuma Ascalonis* insert (*the port of Ascalon*)
P. 76, l. 11, for *1500* read *2500*
P. 81, l. 17, for *then* read *afterwards*
P. 95, l. 5, for *thus* read *then*
P. 95, l. 2 from foot, after *important towns* insert (*as Kanatha, Gerasa, Philadelphia*)
P. 100, l. 11, for *Vita 9: ἡμ.* read *Vita 9. 'Εμ.*
P. 117, l. 12, after *in the district of Gerasa* insert (ἰν τοῖς Γερσενσὶν ὅπῃς)
P. 123, l. 11, for *Perdiccas* read *Perdiccas*
P. 128, l. 9, for *one* read *our*
P. 384, l. 2, bottom, for *No. 4* read *No. IV.*
P. 343, l. 17, for *Artabanus* read *Artapanus*
P. 355, top line, for *them* read *these*

VOL. II.

- P. 14, l. 10, bottom, for *saith* read *fate*
P. 49, l. 7, for *legal decisions* read *legal appointments*
P. 134, last word, for *its* read *their*
P. 166, for *fourth book of Esdras* read *fourth book of Ezra*
P. 195, l. 2, bottom, for *ministration* read *administration*
P. 205, l. 3, bottom, for *Chasidaic* read *Chasidaic*
P. 239, l. 5, for *Capeno* read *Capena*

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

Just published, in Two Vols., 8vo, price 21s.,

NATURE AND THE BIBLE:

LECTURES ON THE MOSAIC HISTORY OF CREATION IN ITS
RELATION TO NATURAL SCIENCE.

By DR. FR. H. REUSCH.

REVISED AND CORRECTED BY THE AUTHOR.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FOURTH EDITION BY KATHLEEN LYTTTELTON.

'Other champions much more competent and learned might have been placed in the field; I will only name one of the most recent, Dr. Reusch, author of "Nature and the Bible."—The Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE.

Just published, in demy 4to, price 14s.,

CREMER'S LEXICON.

SUPPLEMENT

TO
BIBLICO-THEOLOGICAL LEXICON
OF
NEW TESTAMENT GREEK.

By HERMANN CREMER, D.D.

TRANSLATED AND ARRANGED FROM THE THE LAST GERMAN EDITION

By WILLIAM URWICK, M.A.

The Complete Work, including Supplement, is now issued at 38s.

Will shortly be published, in demy 4to,

GRIMM'S LEXICON.

A GREEK-ENGLISH LEXICON
OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

BEING GRIMM'S 'WILKE'S CLAVIS NOVI TESTAMENTI.'

Translated, Revised, and Enlarged

By JOSEPH HENRY THAYER, D.D.,

OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

Just published, in Two Vols., crown 8vo, price 16s.,

THE APOSTOLIC
AND
POST-APOSTOLIC TIMES.

THEIR DIVERSITY AND UNITY IN LIFE AND DOCTRINE.

By G. V. LECHLER, D.D.

THIRD EDITION, THOROUGHLY REVISED AND RE-WITTEN.

TRANSLATED BY A. J. K. DAVIDSON.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

LOTZE'S MICROCOSMUS.

Just published, in Two Vols. 8vo (1450 pages) price 36s.,

MICROCOSMUS :

Concerning Man and his relation to the World.

By **HERMANN LOTZE.**

'These are indeed two masterly volumes, vigorous in intellectual power, and translated with rare ability. . . . This work will doubtless find a place on the shelves of all the foremost thinkers and students of modern times.'—*Evangelical Magazine.*

'Lotze is the ablest, the most brilliant, and most renowned of the German philosophers of to-day. . . . He has rendered invaluable and splendid service to Christian thinkers, and has given them a work which cannot fail to equip them for the sturdiest intellectual conflicts and to ensure their victory.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

'The reputation of Lotze both as a scientist and a philosopher, no less than the merits of the work itself, will not fail to secure the attention of thoughtful readers.'—*Scotsman.*

'The translation of Lotze's *Microcosmus* is the most important of recent events in our philosophical literature. . . . The discussion is carried on on the basis of an almost encyclopædic knowledge, and with the profoundest and subtlest critical insight. We know of no other work containing so much of speculative suggestion, of keen criticism, and of sober judgment on these topics.'—*Andover Review.*

Will shortly be published, in demy 8vo,

**THE JEWISH
AND
THE CHRISTIAN MESSIAH.**

A STUDY IN THE EARLIEST HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY.

BY

VINCENT HENRY STANTON, M.A.,

FELLOW, TUTOR, AND DIVINITY LECTURER OF TRINITY COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE; LATE HULSEMAN LECTURER.

Will shortly be published, in crown 8vo,

BIBLICAL ESSAYS;

OR,

EXEGETICAL STUDIES

**ON THE BOOKS OF JOB, AND JONAH; EZEKIEL'S PROPHECY OF
GOG AND MAGOG, ST. PETER'S 'SPIRITS IN PRISON,' AND
THE KEY TO THE APOCALYPSE.**

By **CHARLES H. H. WRIGHT, D.D.**

OF TRINITY COLLEGE, DUBLIN; M.A. OF EXETER COLLEGE, OXFORD.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

In Twenty Handsome 8vo Volumes, SUBSCRIPTION PRICE £5, 5s.,

MEYER'S
Commentary on the New Testament.

'Meyer has been long and well known to scholars as one of the very ablest of the German expositors of the New Testament. We are not sure whether we ought not to say that he is unrivalled as an interpreter of the grammatical and historical meaning of the sacred writers. The Publishers have now rendered another reasonable and important service to English students in producing this translation.'—*Guardian*.

Each Volume will be sold separately at 10s. 6d. to Non-Subscribers.

**CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL
COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.**

BY DR. H. A. W. MEYER,
OBERCONSISTORIALRATH, HANNOVER.

The portion contributed by Dr. MEYER has been placed under the editorial care of Rev. Dr. DICKSON, Professor of Divinity in the University of Glasgow; Rev. Dr. CROMBIE, Professor of Biblical Criticism, St. Mary's College, St. Andrews; and Rev. Dr. STEWART, Professor of Biblical Criticism, University of Glasgow.

- 1st Year—Romans, Two Volumes.
Galatians, One Volume.
St. John's Gospel, Vol. I.
- 2d Year—St. John's Gospel, Vol. II.
Philippians and Colossians, One Volume.
Acts of the Apostles, Vol. I.
Corinthians, Vol. I.
- 3d Year—Acts of the Apostles, Vol. II.
St. Matthew's Gospel, Two Volumes.
Corinthians, Vol. II.
- 4th Year—Mark and Luke, Two Volumes.
Ephesians and Philemon, One Volume.
Thessalonians. (Dr. Lünemann.)
- 5th Year—Timothy and Titus. (Dr. Huther.)
Peter and Jude. (Dr. Huther.)
Hebrews. (Dr. Lünemann.)
James and John. (Dr. Huther.)

The series, as written by Meyer himself, is completed by the publication of Ephesians with Philemon in one volume. But to this the Publishers have thought it right to add Thessalonians and Hebrews, by Dr. Lünemann, and the Pastoral and Catholic Epistles, by Dr. Huther. So few, however, of the Subscribers have expressed a desire to have Dr. Dürstedeck's Commentary on Revelation included, that it has been resolved in the meantime not to undertake it.

'I need hardly add that the last edition of the accurate, perspicuous, and learned commentary of Dr. Meyer has been most carefully consulted throughout; and I must again, as in the preface to the Galatians, avow my great obligations to the acumen and scholarship of the learned editor.'—BISHOP ELLICOTT in *Preface to his 'Commentary on Ephesians.'*

'The ablest grammatical exegete of the age.'—PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D.

'In accuracy of scholarship and freedom from prejudice, he is equalled by few.'—*Literary Churchman*.

'We have only to repeat that it remains, of its own kind, the very best Commentary of the New Testament which we possess.'—*Church Bells*.

'No exegetical work is on the whole more valuable, or stands in higher public esteem. As a critic he is candid and cautious; exact to minuteness in philology; a master of the grammatical and historical method of interpretation.'—*Princeton Review*.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

Just published, in demy 8vo, price 12s.,

AN INTRODUCTION TO THEOLOGY:
Its Principles, Its Branches, Its Results, and Its Literature.

By **ALFRED CAVE, B.A.,**
PRINCIPAL, AND PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY, OF HACKNEY COLLEGE, LONDON.

'We can most heartily recommend this work to students of every degree of attainment, and not only to those who will have the opportunity of utilizing its aid in the most sacred of the professions, but to all who desire to encourage and systematise their knowledge and clarify their views of Divine things.'—*Nonconformist and English Independent.*

'We know of no work more likely to prove useful to divinity students. Its arrangement is perfect, its learning accurate and extensive, and its practical hints invaluable.'—*Christian World.*

'Professor Cave is a master of theological science. He is one of the men to whose industry there seems no limit. . . . We can only say that we have rarely read a book with more cordial approval.'—*Baptist Magazine.*

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 1s. 6d.,

THE BIBLE
AN OUTGROWTH OF THEOCRATIC LIFE.

By **D. W. SIMON,**
PRINCIPAL OF THE CONGREGATIONAL COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

'A book of absorbing interest, and well worthy of study.'—*Methodist New Connexion Magazine.*

'We heartily recommend every one who desires a better understanding of the true character of the Book of Books to procure it at once and make a study of it. . . . A more completely satisfactory book we have not had through our hands for a long time.'—*Aberdeen Journal.*

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 8s. 6d.,

THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF ISRAEL.

A Discussion of the Chief Problems in Old Testament History,
as opposed to the Development Theorists.

By **DR. FRIEDRICH EDUARD KÖNIG,**
THE UNIVERSITY, LEIPZIG.

TRANSLATED BY **REV. ALEXANDER J. CAMPBELL, M.A.**

'An admirable little volume. . . . By sincere and earnest minded students it will be cordially welcomed.'—*Freeman.*

'Every page of the book deserves study.'—*Church Bells.*

Just published, in crown 8vo, price 6s.,

**NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING IN
PASTORAL THEOLOGY.**

By **J. T. BECK, D.D.,**
PROF. ORD. THEOL., TÜBINGEN.

EDITED BY **PROFESSOR B. RIGGENBACH.**

TRANSLATED BY **REV. JAS. MCCLYMONT, B.D., AND REV. THOS. NICOL, B.D.**

'The volume contains much which any thoughtful and earnest Christian minister will find helpful and suggestive to him for the wise and efficient discharge of his sacred functions.'—*Literary World.*

PUBLICATIONS OF
T. AND T. CLARK,
38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH.
LONDON: HAMILTON, ADAMS, & CO.

- Adam (J., D.D.)**—AN EXPOSITION OF THE EPISTLE OF JAMES. 8vo, 9s.
Alexander (Dr. J. A.)—COMMENTARY ON THE PROPHECIES OF ISAIAH.
 New and Revised Edition. Two vols. 8vo, 17s.
Ante-Nicene Christian Library—A COLLECTION OF ALL THE WORKS
 OF THE FATHERS OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH PRIOR TO THE COUNCIL OF
 NICÆA. Twenty-four vols. 8vo, Subscription price, £6, 6s.
Auberlen (C. A.)—THE DIVINE REVELATION. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
Augustine's Works—Edited by MARCUS DODS, D.D. Fifteen vols.
 8vo, Subscription price, £3, 19s.
Bannerman (Professor)—THE CHURCH OF CHRIST: A Treatise on the
 Nature, Powers, etc. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
Baumgarten (Professor)—APOSTOLIC HISTORY; Being an Account of
 the Development of the Early Church. Three vols. 8vo, 27s.
Beck (Dr.)—OUTLINES OF BIBLICAL PSYCHOLOGY. Crown 8vo, 4s.
 — PASTORAL THEOLOGY. Crown 8vo, 6s.
Bengel—GNOMON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. With Original Notes,
 Explanatory and Illustrative. Five vols. 8vo, Subscription price, 31s. 6d.
Cheaper Edition, the five volumes bound in three, 24s.
Besser's CHRIST THE LIFE OF THE WORLD. Price 6s.
Bible-Class Handbooks. Crown 8vo.
 BINNIE (Prof.)—The Church, 1s. 6d.
 BROWN (Principal)—The Epistle to the Romans, 2s.
 CANDLISH (Prof.)—The Christian Sacraments, 1s. 6d.
 DAVIDSON (Prof.)—The Epistle to the Hebrews, 2s. 6d.
 DODS (MARCUS, D.D.)—The Post-Exilian Prophets, 2s.
 — The Book of Genesis, 2s.
 DOUGLAS (Principal)—The Book of Joshua, 1s. 6d.
 — The Book of Judges, 1s. 8d.
 HENDERSON (ARCHIBALD, M.A.)—Palestine, with Maps. *The maps are by*
Captain Conder, R.E., of the Palestine Exploration Fund. Price 2s. 6d.
 LINDSAY (Prof.)—The Gospel of St. Mark, 2s. 6d.
 — The Reformation, 2s.
 — The Acts of the Apostles, Part I., Ch. I.-XII., 1s. 6d.
 MACGREGOR (Prof.)—The Epistle to the Galatians, 1s. 6d.
 MACPHERSON (JOHN, M.A.)—Presbyterianism, 1s. 6d.
 — The Westminster Confession of Faith, 2s.
 MURPHY (Prof.)—The Books of Chronicles, 1s. 6d.
 SCRYMGEOUR (WM.)—Lessons on the Life of Christ, 2s. 6d.
 STALKER (JAMES, M.A.)—The Life of Christ, 1s. 6d.
 — The Life of St. Paul, 1s. 6d.
 SMITH (GEORGE, LL.D.)—A Short History of Missions, 2s. 6d.
 WALKER (NORMAN L., M.A.)—Scottish Church History, 1s. 6d.
 WHYTE (ALEXANDER, D.D.)—The Shorter Catechism, 2s. 6d.
Bible-Class Primers. Paper covers, 6d. each; free by post, 7d. In
 cloth, 8d. each; free by post, 9d.
 CROSKERY (Prof.)—Joshua and the Conquest.
 GIVEN (Prof.)—The Kings of Judah.
 GLOAG (PATON J., D.D.)—Life of Paul.
 IVERACH (JAMES, M.A.)—Life of Moses.
 SALMOND (Prof.)—Life of Peter.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

- Gloag (P. J., D.D.)**—INTRODUCTION TO THE PAULINE EPISTLES. 8vo, 12s.
 — EXEGETICAL STUDIES. Crown 8vo, 5s.
- Godet (Prof.)**—COMMENTARY ON ST. LUKE'S GOSPEL. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
 — COMMENTARY ON ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.
 — COMMENTARY ON ST. PAUL'S EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
 — LECTURES IN DEFENCE OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH. Cr. 8vo, 6s.
- Goebel (Siegfried)**—THE PARABLES OF JESUS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Gotthold's Emblems; or, INVISIBLE THINGS UNDERSTOOD BY THINGS THAT ARE MADE.** Crown 8vo, 5s.
- Guyot (Arnold, LL.D.)**—CREATION; or, The Biblical Cosmogony in the Light of Modern Science. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo, 5s. 6d.
- Hagenbach (Dr. K. R.)**—HISTORY OF DOCTRINES. Edited, with large additions from various sources. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.
 — HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY AND SWITZERLAND CHIEFLY. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- Hall (Rev. Newman, LL.B.)**—THE LORD'S PRAYER: A Practical Meditation. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Harless (Dr. C. A.)**—SYSTEM OF CHRISTIAN ETHICS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Harris (Rev. S., D.D.)**—THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF THEISM. 8vo, 12s.
- Haupt (Erich)**—THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. JOHN. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Hävernick (H. A. Ch.)**—INTRODUCTION TO OLD TESTAMENT. 10s. 6d.
- Heard (Rev. J. B., M.A.)**—THE TRIPARTITE NATURE OF MAN—SPIRIT, SOUL, AND BODY—applied to Illustrate and Explain the Doctrine of Original Sin, the New Birth, the Disembodied State, and the Spiritual Body. With an Appendix on the Fatherhood of God. Fifth Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.
 — THE OLD AND NEW THEOLOGY. Crown 8vo, 6s.
- Hefele (Bishop)**—A HISTORY OF THE COUNCILS OF THE CHURCH. Vol. I., to A.D. 325; Vol. II., A.D. 325 to 429. Vol. III., A.D. 431 to the close of the Council of Chalcedon, 451. 8vo, 12s. each.
- Hengstenberg (Professor)**—COMMENTARY ON PSALMS. 3 vols. 8vo, 33s.
 — COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES. Treatises on the Song of Solomon, Job, and on Isaiah, etc. 8vo, 9s.
 — THE PROPHECIES OF EZEKIEL ELUCIDATED. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
 — DISSERTATIONS ON THE GENUINENESS OF DANIEL, AND THE INTEGRITY OF ZECHARIAH. 8vo, 12s.
 — HISTORY OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
 — CHRISTOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s.
 — ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- Hermes Triemnegistus**—THEOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS. Translated from the original Greek by J. D. CHAMBERS, M.A. 8vo, 6s.
- Herzog**—ENCYCLOPÆDIA OR DICTIONARY OF BIBLICAL, HISTORICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY. *Based on the Real-Encyclopædie of Herzog, Plitt, and Hauck.* Edited by Professor SCHAFF, D.D. In Three vols., price 24s. each.
- Hutchison (John, D.D.)**—COMMENTARY ON THESSALONIANS. 8vo, 9s.
- Janet (Paul)**—FINAL CAUSES. By PAUL JANET, Member of the Institute. Translated from the French. Second Edition, demy 8vo, 12s.
 — THE THEORY OF MORALS. Translated from the latest French Edition. Demy 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Jouffroy**—PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAYS. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.
- Junii (Francisci)**—Opuscula Theologica Selecta. 4to, vellum, 16s.
- Kant**—THE METAPHYSIC OF ETHICS. Crown 8vo, 6s.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

- Keil (Prof.)**—COMMENTARY ON THE PENTATEUCH. 3 vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.
 ——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF JOSHUA, JUDGES, AND RUTH. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
 ——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
 ——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF KINGS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
 ——— COMMENTARY ON THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
 ——— COMMENTARY ON EZRA, NEHEMIAH, ESTHER. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
 ——— COMMENTARY ON JEREMIAH. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
 ——— COMMENTARY ON EZEKIEL. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
 ——— COMMENTARY ON DANIEL. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
 ——— ON THE BOOKS OF THE MINOR PROPHETS. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
 ——— MANUAL OF HISTORICO-CRITICAL INTRODUCTION TO THE CANONICAL SCRIPTURES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
Keymer (Rev. N., M.A.)—NOTES ON GENESIS. Crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.
Killen (Prof.)—THE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH; or, The History, Doctrine, Worship, and Polity of the Christians, traced to A.D. 755. 8vo, 9s.
König (Dr. F. E.)—THE RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF ISRAEL. A Discussion of the Chief Problems in Old Testament History as opposed to the Development Theorists. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
Krummacher (Dr. F. W.)—THE SUFFERING SAVIOUR; or, Meditations on the Last Days of the Sufferings of Christ. Eighth Edit., crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.
 ——— DAVID, THE KING OF ISRAEL: A Portrait drawn from Bible History and the Book of Psalms. Second Edition, crown 8vo, 7s. 6d.
 ——— AUTOBIOGRAPHY. Crown 8vo, 6s.
Kurtz (Prof.)—HANDBOOK OF CHURCH HISTORY. Two vols. 8vo, 15s.
 ——— HISTORY OF THE OLD COVENANT. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.
Ladd (Prof. G. T.)—THE DOCTRINE OF SACRED SCRIPTURE: A Critical, Historical, and Dogmatic Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments. Two vols. 8vo, 1600 pp., 28s.
Laidlaw (Prof.)—THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF MAN. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
Lange (J. P., D.D.)—THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. Edited, with additional Notes, by MARCUS DODS, D.D. Second Edition, in Four vols. 8vo, Subscription price 28s.
 ——— COMMENTARIES ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS. Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. OLD TESTAMENT, 14 vols.; NEW TESTAMENT, 10 vols.; APOCRYPHA, 1 vol. Subscription price, nett, 15s. each.
 ——— ON ST. MATTHEW AND ST. MARK. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.
 ——— ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE. Two vols. 8vo, 18s.
 ——— ON THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
Lehmann (Pastor)—SCENES FROM THE LIFE OF JESUS. Cr. 8vo, 3s. 6d.
Lewis (Tayler, LL.D.)—THE SIX DAYS OF CREATION. Cr. 8vo, 7s. 6d.
Lisco (F. G.)—PARABLES OF JESUS EXPLAINED. Fcap. 8vo, 5s.
Lotze (Professor)—MICROCOSMOS. *In preparation.*
Luthardt, Kannis, and Brückner—THE CHURCH. Crown 8vo, 5s.
Luthardt (Prof.)—ST. JOHN THE AUTHOR OF THE FOURTH GOSPEL. 9s.
 ——— ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL DESCRIBED AND EXPLAINED ACCORDING TO ITS PECULIAR CHARACTER. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.
 ——— APOLOGETIC LECTURES ON THE FUNDAMENTAL (*Sixth Edition*), SAYING (*Fourth Edition*), MORAL TRUTHS OF CHRISTIANITY (*Third Edition*). Three vols. crown 8vo, 6s. each.
M'Coah (Dr. Jas.)—PHILOSOPHIC SERIES. Part I. (Didactic). Nos. I.-IV. now ready. Part II. (Historical). Issued in Bi-Monthly Numbers. Price 2s. each.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

- Macdonald (Rev. D.)**—INTRODUCTION TO THE PENTATEUCH. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- THE CREATION AND FALL. 8vo, 12s.
- McLauchlan (T., D.D., LL.D.)**—THE EARLY SCOTTISH CHURCH. To the Middle of the Twelfth Century. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Mair (A., D.D.)**—STUDIES IN THE CHRISTIAN EVIDENCES. Cr. 8vo, 6s.
- Martensen (Bishop)**—CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS: A Compendium of the Doctrines of Christianity. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (GENERAL ETHICS.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (INDIVIDUAL ETHICS.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- CHRISTIAN ETHICS. (SOCIAL ETHICS.) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Matheson (Geo., D.D.)**—GROWTH OF THE SPIRIT OF CHRISTIANITY, from the First Century to the Dawn of the Lutheran Era. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- AIDS TO THE STUDY OF GERMAN THEOLOGY. 3rd Edition, 4s. 6d.
- Meyer (Dr.)**—CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON ST. MATTHEW'S GOSPEL. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- ON MARK AND LUKE. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- ON ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- ON ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- ON CORINTHIANS. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- ON GALATIANS. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- ON EPHESIANS AND PHILEMON. One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- ON PHILIPPIANS AND COLOSSIANS. One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- ON THESSALONIANS. (*Dr. Lünemann.*) One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. (*Dr. Huther.*) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. (*Dr. Lünemann.*) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- ST. JAMES' AND ST. JOHN'S EPISTLES. (*Huther.*) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- PETER AND JUDE. (*Dr. Huther.*) One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Michie (Charles, M.A.)**—BIBLE WORDS AND PHRASES, EXPLAINED AND ILLUSTRATED. 18mo, 1s.
- Monrad (Dr. D. G.)**—THE WORLD OF PRAYER; or, Prayer in relation to Personal Religion. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.
- Morgan (J., D.D.)**—SCRIPTURE TESTIMONY TO THE HOLY SPIRIT. 9s.
- EXPOSITION OF THE FIRST EPISTLE OF JOHN. 8vo, 9s.
- Müller (Dr. Julius)**—THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SIN. An entirely New Translation from the Fifth German Edition. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- Murphy (Professor)**—COMMENTARY ON THE PSALMS. 8vo, 12s.
- A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON EXODUS. 9s.
- Naville (Ernest)**—THE PROBLEM OF EVIL. Crown 8vo, 4s. 6d.
- THE CHRIST. Translated by Rev. T. J. DESPRÉS. Cr. 8vo, 4s. 6d.
- MODERN PHYSICS: Studies Historical and Philosophical. Translated by Rev. HENRY DOWNTON, M.A. Crown 8vo, 5s.
- Nicoll (W. R., M.A.)**—THE INCARNATE SAVIOUR: A Life of Jesus Christ. Crown 8vo, 6s.
- Neander (Dr.)**—GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION AND CHURCH. Nine vols. 8vo, £3, 7s. 6d.
- Oehler (Prof.)**—THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.
- Oosterzee (Dr. Van)**—THE YEAR OF SALVATION. Words of Life for Every Day. A Book of Household Devotion. Two vols. 8vo, 7s. 6d. each.
- MOSES: A Biblical Study. Crown 8vo, 6s.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

- Olshausen (Dr. H.)**—BIBLICAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPELS AND ACTS. Four vols. 8vo, £2, 2s. *Cheaper Edition*, four vols. crown 8vo, 24s.
- **ROMANS.** One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- **CORINTHIANS.** One vol. 8vo, 9s.
- **PHILIPPIANS, TITUS, AND FIRST TIMOTHY.** One vol. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Orelli**—OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY REGARDING THE CONSUMMATION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Owen (Dr. John)**—WORKS. *Best and only Complete Edition.* Edited by Rev. Dr. GOULD. Twenty-four vols. 8vo, Subscription price, £4, 4s. The '*Hebrews*' may be had separately, in Seven vols., £2, 2s. nett.
- Philippi (F. A.)**—COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. From the Third Improved Edition, by Rev. Professor BANKS. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- Piper (Dr. Ferdinand)**—LIVES OF THE LEADERS OF THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- Popular Commentary on the New Testament.** Edited by PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. With Illustrations and Maps. Vol. I.—THE SYNOPTICAL GOSPELS. Vol. II.—ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL, AND THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. Vol. III.—ROMANS TO PHILEMON. Vol. IV.—HEBREWS TO REVELATION. In Four vols. imperial 8vo, 18s. each.
- Pressensé (Edward de)**—THE REDEEMER: Discourses. Crown 8vo, 6s.
- Rabiger (Prof.)**—ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF THEOLOGY. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- Rainy (Principal)**—DELIVERY AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. (*The Fifth Series of the Cunningham Lectures.*) 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Reusch (Professor)**—BIBLE AND NATURE. *In preparation.*
- Reuss (Professor)**—HISTORY OF THE SACRED SCRIPTURES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. 640 pp. 8vo, 16s.
- Riehm (Dr. E.)**—MESSIANIC PROPHECY: Its Origin, Historical Character, and Relation to New Testament Fulfilment. Crown 8vo, 5s.
- Ritter (Carl)**—THE COMPARATIVE GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE AND THE SINAITIC PENINSULA. Four vols. 8vo, 32s.
- Robinson (Rev. S., D.D.)**—DISCOURSES ON REDEMPTION. 8vo, 7s. 6d.
- Robinson (Edward, D.D.)**—GREEK AND ENGLISH LEXICON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. 8vo, 9s.
- Rothe (Professor)**—SERMONS FOR THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. Cr. 8vo, 6s.
- Saisset**—MANUAL OF MODERN PANTHEISM. Two vols. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Sartorius (Dr. E.)**—DOCTRINE OF DIVINE LOVE. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Schaff (Professor)**—HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. (New Edition, thoroughly Revised and Enlarged.)
- APOSTOLIC CHRISTIANITY, A.D. 1-100. In Two Divisions. Ex. 8vo, 21s.
- ANTE-NICENE CHRISTIANITY, A.D. 100-325. In Two Divisions. Ex. 8vo, 21s.
- POST-NICENE CHRISTIANITY, A.D. 325-600. In Two Divisions. Ex. 8vo, 21s.
- THE MIDDLE AGES (to Gregory VII.) In Two Divisions. Ex. 8vo, 21s.
- Schmid's BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.** 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Schürer (Prof.)**—HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TIMES. *In preparation.*
- Scott (Jas., M.A., D.D.)**—PRINCIPLES OF NEW TESTAMENT QUOTATION ESTABLISHED AND APPLIED TO BIBLICAL CRITICISM. Cr. 8vo, 2nd Edit., 4s.
- Shedd (W., D.D.)**—HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- SERMONS TO THE NATURAL MAN. 8vo, 7s. 6d.
- SERMONS TO THE SPIRITUAL MAN. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

T. and T. Clark's Publications.

- Smeaton (Professor)**—THE DOCTRINE OF THE ATONEMENT AS TAUGHT BY CHRIST HIMSELF. Second Edition, 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. (*Ninth Series of Cunningham Lectures.*) 8vo, 9s.
- Smith (Professor Thos., D.D.)**—MEDIÆVAL MISSIONS. Cr. 8vo, 4s. 6d.
- Stalker (Rev. Jas., M.A.)**—THE LIFE OF JESUS CHRIST. New Edition, in larger Type. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
- THE LIFE OF ST. PAUL. New Edition, in larger Type. Crown 8vo, 3s. 6d.
- Steinmeyer (Dr. F. L.)**—THE MIRACLES OF OUR LORD : Examined in their relation to Modern Criticism. 8vo, 7s. 6d.
- THE HISTORY OF THE PASSION AND RESURRECTION OF OUR LORD, considered in the Light of Modern Criticism. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Stevenson (Mrs.)**—THE SYMBOLIC PARABLES : The Predictions of the Apocalypse viewed in relation to the General Truths of Scripture. Crown 8vo, 5s.
- Steward (Rev. G.)**—MEDIATORIAL SOVEREIGNTY : The Mystery of Christ and the Revelation of the Old and New Testaments. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- THE ARGUMENT OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS. A Posthumous Work. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Stier (Dr. Rudolph)**—ON THE WORDS OF THE LORD JESUS. Eight vols. 8vo, £4, 4s. Separate volumes may be had, price 10s. 6d.
In order to bring this valuable Work more within the reach of all Classes, both Clergy and Laity, Messrs. Clark continue to supply the Eight-volume Edition bound in FOUR at the Original Subscription price of £2, 2s.
- THE WORDS OF THE RISEN SAVIOUR, AND COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- THE WORDS OF THE APOSTLES EXPOUNDED. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Tholuck (Professor)**—COMMENTARY ON GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. 8vo, 9s.
- THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS. Two vols. fcap. 8vo, 8s.
- LIGHT FROM THE CROSS. Third Edition, crown 8vo, 5s.
- COMMENTARY ON THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Tophel (Pastor G.)**—THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. Cr. 8vo, 2s. 6d.
- Uhlhorn (G.)**—CHRISTIAN CHARITY IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH. Cr. 8vo, 6s.
- Ullmann (Dr. Carl)**—REFORMERS BEFORE THE REFORMATION, principally in Germany and the Netherlands. Two vols. 8vo, 21s.
- THE SINLESSNESS OF JESUS : An Evidence for Christianity. Fourth Edition, crown 8vo, 6s.
- Urwick (W., M.A.)**—THE SERVANT OF JEHOVAH : A Commentary upon Isaiah lli. 13–liii. 12; with Dissertations upon Isaiah xl.–lxvi. 8vo, 6s.
- Vinet (Professor)**—STUDIES ON BLAISE PASCAL. Crown 8vo, 5s.
- PASTORAL THEOLOGY. Second Edition, post 8vo, 3s. 6d.
- Watts (Professor)**—THE NEWER CRITICISM AND THE ANALOGY OF THE FAITH. Third Edition, crown 8vo, 5s.
- Weiss (Prof.)**—BIBLICAL THEOLOGY OF NEW TESTAMENT. 2 vols. 8vo, 21s.
- LIFE OF CHRIST. Three vols. 8vo, 31s. 6d.
- White (Rev. M.)**—SYMBOLICAL NUMBERS OF SCRIPTURE. Cr. 8vo, 4s.
- Williams (W. H., M.A.)**—A SELECT VOCABULARY OF LATIN ETYMOLOGY. For the use of Schools. Fcap. 8vo, 1s. 6d.
- Winer (Dr. G. B.)**—A TREATISE ON THE GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK, regarded as the Basis of New Testament Exegesis. Third Edition, edited by W. F. MOULTON, D.D. Ninth English Edition, 8vo, 15s.
- A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE DOCTRINES AND CONFESSIONS OF THE VARIOUS COMMUNITIES OF CHRISTENDOM. 8vo, 10s. 6d.
- Wuttke (Professor)**—CHRISTIAN ETHICS. Two vols. 8vo, 12s. 6d.

